This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

BT
837
.A53
COP.2

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

THE

"TWO OPINIONS,"

OR

SALVATION & DAMNATION;

BEING AN

INQUIRY INTO THE TRUTH

OF CERTAIN

THEOLOGICAL TENETS

Prevalent in the Year of our Lord,

1837.

By L. F. W. ANDREWS,
Minister of Reconciliation.

"How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him."—1 Kings, xviii. 21.

MACON, Ga.
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.
1837.

BT
837
.A53
cop. 2

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the District Court of Georgia, 1837.

217-A

PREFACE.

If the reader is desirous of knowing the *why* and the *wherefore* of the following pages, his desire shall be granted. The author, in his various pilgrimages through the land, in the character of an "Evangelist of the grace of God," has frequently been asked for some work which will present at one view the essentials of the faith he advocates, and the points of difference, with the reasons for the same, between said faith and the popular Theology of the age. Such a work is not extant, and hence many sincere inquirers after truth are prevented from prosecuting that examination to which their minds are disposed, and which would readily be given, were the means of doing so in their hands, without too great a sacrifice of their time and attention. The careful perusal of the various valuable works already published in favor of the final and blessed "restitution of all things," were these within reach, would be a task too arduous for many to undertake, while a single volume could be taken up at a leisure hour and be perused with interest and profit.

Such a volume, so comprehensive as to present a general view of the whole matter at issue between Universalists and their opponents, and yet sufficiently copious in style for popular use, would seem then to be a *desideratum* in our literature which ought promptly to be supplied. Convinced also of the fact, that it is in vain to hope for any thing like a fair representation of the doctrine of *Universal Salvation* from the pens or lips of uncharitable, malignant or ignorant teachers of *partial* creeds and systems; and moreover, that the people *must have light* before they can be expected to embrace sun-

timents radically different from those they have been accustomed to hear inculcated from the sacred desk and from the Bible, the duty becomes imperative that some one should gird himself to the labor of preparing and publishing a work which will supply the deficiency so palpable, especially in the South.

This duty the undersigned has undertaken, and now offers to the public the fruits of his labors, with the humble hope that those of his fellow creatures who are "halting between two opinions," and those who have *doubts* and anxious forebodings concerning their own immortal destiny, and that of their friends of the human family—a class for whose benefit he chiefly writes—will come to a *decision* in the case, at once honorable to the character of God, and full of hope and joy to their own souls.

To his brethren of various opposing denominations the author would say a word. It is the voice of reason and inspiration that we should "*prove all things* and hold fast that which is good,"—that we should "*try* the spirits whether they be of God." In obedience to these injunctions you are bound to read with candor, and judge without prejudice, what is herewith presented for your consideration. And even though you may find ideas and sentiments novel in character and adverse to your preconceived opinions, still it is your duty to examine carefully before you pronounce a verdict of condemnation, for the wise man hath said, "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame unto him." *Truth* does not fear the most rigid investigation, and no one who entertains erroneous opinions on any subject ought to desire to remain in bondage thereto a single moment, though all the world besides should "be of a contrary part." Let it be remembered, that the Truth of God was no less true when the Prophet Elijah stood alone in its defence, notwithstanding he was opposed by four hundred and fifty Prophets of Baal—a fact which should serve as a lesson to us not to judge one system false because its advocates may be few in number, or another true because thousands acknow-

ledge its influence. It is possible too, that in our running after the prize of our high calling, the race may not always be to those who are swift, nor, in the fight of faith, will victory invariably perch on the standard of those who are strong. The question of greatest moment always is, "*What is Truth?*" Like the rod of the Jewish High Priest this swallows up all others, and, by its magical power, all lying divinations, imposture and sorceries will eventually be driven to the shades of eternal night. So mote it be. Amen.

L. F. W. ANDREWS.

November, 1837.

THE

TWO OPINIONS, &c.

CHAPTER I.

A comparative view of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopalian, Baptist and Catholic Creeds, showing the points of ag eement and difference between them, and their united disagreement with Universalism.

At first view, it would appear that there is a vast difference of opinion among the various orders of professing religionists in the world, touching what are deemed essential points of the Christian system. The almost countless number of sects in the Church; the want of fellowship between them; their strife and bitterness; their devotion to different objects; their adherence to different rites and customs, and their worship in separate temples, would indicate to the casual observer some cardinal discrepancy in faith among the contending parties. A critical examination of the subject will prove to a demonstration that the difference is more apparent than real, or, at least, that the many orders of professing Christians have originated more from a diversity of opinion touching *non-essentials* in *faith*, and *unimportant customs* and *ceremonies*, than from any *radical* variance in relation to the truly *major doctrines* of Theology. On *minor* topics only have men divided and subdivided—on matters of no more important difference than there is between Shibboleth and Sibboleth have secessions taken place and new sects arisen, until even infidelity is emboldened to cry imposture, and the unreflecting are involved in a labyrinth of uncertainty as to the true character of Christianity itself.

It is our purpose then in this chapter to show that the four protestant sects before named, are in truth *united* in opinion on all the principal topics of popular theology, and that they are natural daughters of that Church whom they have so ungraciously, and with so little filial regard, denounced as the "*Mother of Harlots* and abominations of the earth." Of late, especially, has the Catholic Church been made the subject of the most virulent abuse and unchristian hostility of several Protestant sects in the northern section of the United States. The Press has groaned under the burden of denunciation, and the sacred desk itself has been prostituted to the unholy purpose of fanning the flame of prejudice and wrath against a very numerous and highly respectable order of Christian people, and one too, confessedly the most worthy of respect on account of her age, and the virtues, talents and learning of her priesthood.

But let it not be supposed that this opposition has for its cause a mighty and essential difference in matters of faith and duty. Such is by no means the case, as will more fully appear when we come to examine in detail the creeds of the various leading denominations of the age, and compare the same with the principles of the Mother Church. And we shall be much mistaken if this examination does not prove that "*as is the mother so is her daughter*;" and that, *if* the old Dame is justly entitled to the cognomen before mentioned, the various progeny which have from time to time abandoned the maternal roof do but expose their own degeneracy and shame, by exhibiting those features and imitating those vices which identify them as the lineal offspring of so profligate a parentage!

With a view to a proper understanding of the matter in hand, let the inquiry be made concerning certain prominent doctrines of the Protestant Church. We will select those tenets in the belief of which the various sects "meet upon the level and part upon the square," and in defence of which they rally under the same banner and do battle under one common standard. And first, of the

NATURE OF THE SUPREME BEING.

The Presbyterian Church thus avows her faith on this fundamental topic.

"There is but one only living and true God who is infinite in being and perfection, a most pure spirit, invisible, without body, parts or passions, immutable," &c. &c.—*Confession of Faith, chap.* ii. §1.

"In *unity* of the Godhead there be *three* persons of one substance power and eternity; God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."—*Ib. ch.* ii. 3.

"Q. How many persons are there in the Godhead?

"A. There be three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one true Eternal God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; although distinguished by their personal properties."—*Larger Catechism, Quest.* 9, *p.* 144, *ed.* 1834.

"There are three persons in the Godhead; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; and these three are *one* God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory."—*Shorter Catechism, Ans.* 6.

The Episcopal Creed, Articles 1st, 2d & 3th, reads thus:

"Art. 1. *Of Faith in the Holy Trinity.* There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions; of infinite power, wisdom and goodness; the Maker and Preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this Godhead, there be three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity; the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

Art. 2. *Of the Word, or Son of God, which was made very man.* The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very Man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried. to reconcile his Father to us and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.

Art. 5. The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one Substance, Majesty and Glory, with the Father and Son, very and eternal God."

The Methodist Church have adopted the foregoing from the Episcopal Creed, omitting the phrase "or passions," in the first article, and "begotten from everlasting of the Father," in the second; and the Baptist Church, in the 2d chapter and 3d section of their Creed, thus speaks of the "Holy Trinity."

"In this divine and infinite Being, there are three subsistences, the Father, the Word (or Son) and Holy Spirit, of one substance, power and eternity, each having the whole divine essence, yet the essence undivided; the Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding, the Son is eternally begotten of the Father, the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, all Infinite without beginning, therefore but one *God*, who is not to be divided in nature and being, but distinguished by several peculiar relative properties and personal relations, which doctrine of the Trinity is the foundation of all our communion with God, and our comfortable dependence on him"—*Confession of Faith adopted by the Baptist Association, Philadelphia, Sept.* 1742, *Pittsburg ed.* 1831.

And according to the faith of these several protestant Churches so has the Catholic Church always believed, with this difference only, that the Mother Church avows her principles with more boldness than do her daughters. Considering Christ to have been *begotten* by the Father and the woman Mary as the mother of Jesus, the "second person in the adorable Trinity," they extend their worship to the *Mother* as well as the Father. The ascription of divine honors to the Virgin Mary, as the "*Mother of God*," is therefore consistent, and no Trinitarian should find fault with the Catholic for so doing, as the latter only carries out the doctrine to its legitimate results.

In Doyle's edition of the "Manual of Piety," (a Catholic work,) page 249, section 2d, of the "Summary of Christian faith and morality," the following item is put on record:

"2d. Every Christian is bound to believe that in this one God [acknowledged in the preceding section] there are three

several persons, perfectly equal and of the same substance; the Father who proceeds from no one; the Son who is born of the Father before all ages; and the Holy Ghost who proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, and that these three really distinct persons have all the same power and the same wisdom, and are all three one and the same Lord, one and the same God."

Thus it will be seen that there is a perfect unity of faith between Catholics and Protestants, on the subject of a Trinity in the Godhead. Let us therefore pass to notice other topics, such as

ORIGINAL SIN AND TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

These two being "Siamese Twins" in their connexion, will be considered together. And they are thus set forth in the Presbyterian Confession:

"*Of the Fall of Man, &c.*—Our first parents, being seduced by the subtilty and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit.

2. By this sin they fell from their original righteousness, and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.

3. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation.

4. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."

The Articles of the Episcopal Church hold forth similar sentiments, as follows:

"Art. 9. *Of original and birth sin.*—Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the Spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.

Art. 10. *Of Free Will.*—The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith,

and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will."

So also of the Methodist Creed, which on examination I find to be almost a *fac simile* of the Episcopal Articles of Faith, and need not therefore be quoted at length. The Baptist Confession before mentioned in speaking of Adam's sin in eating the forbidden fruit, thus states the sentiment:

"2. Our first parents by this sin, fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and we in them, whereby death came upon all; all becoming dead in sin, and wholly defiled, in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.

"3. They being the root, and, by God's appointment, standing in the room and stead of all mankind; the guilt of the sin was imputed, and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation, being now conceived in sin, and by nature children of wrath, the servants of sin, the subjects of death, and all other miseries, spiritual, temporal and eternal, unless the Lord Jesus set them free.

"4. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions."—p. 26.

If now we call on the Catholic to inform us what his faith is on these topics, he will give you an answer in the words of the *third* item of "What every Christian must believe:"—*Manual of Piety, p.* 249.

"3. We must all believe that this God created the angels to be with him forever, and that one part fell from God by sin, and became Devils; that God also created Adam and Eve, our first parents, and placed them in the earthly paradise, whence they were justly banished for the sin they committed in eating of the fruit of the forbidden tree; and that by this transgression of Adam we are all born in sin, and must have been lost forever, if God had not sent us a Saviour."

The same uniformity is likewise discoverable in the Catholic and Protestant Creeds touching the doctrine of

MIRACULOUS REGENERATION,

A doctrine which seems inseparably connected with and deducible from the foregoing. For if the nature of mankind is totally defiled and wholly inclined to all evil, it would seem to be a necessary inference that it must experience a radical change before it can be inclined in an opposite direction; and as nothing short of Almighty power created in the first instance, so nothing less than the same Almightiness can be supposed to effect the needed renovation in the creature from corruption to holiness. On this point the Presbyterian holds that

"1. All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly, to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them a heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good; and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely being made willing by his grace.

"2. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man; who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it."—pp. 49—51.

"3. Their ability to do good works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ. And that they may be enabled thereunto, besides the graces they have already received, there is required an actual influence of the same Holy Spirit to work in them to will and to do of his good pleasure."—p. 70.

The Baptist Confession (page 34) presents the substance and nearly the language of the above extract, and the Articles of the Episcopal Church declare that "we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ," and also that some are "*called* according to God's purpose, by his *Spirit* working in due season." And although the same doctrine is not expressly

laid down in the Methodist creed, yet it is certain that no class of professing Christians dwell more than do they on sudden and extraordinary manifestations of God's Spirit in the process of conversion The pretensions of nearly all sects in this particular, especially in seasons of revival measures and camp-meeting operations, would seem indeed to claim for themselves the same tokens of the special presence of Jehohah, in these days, which were exhibited on the day of Pentecost and in the age of miracles. And as do the Protestants, so has the Catholic Church always claimed for herself those visible evidences of Divine Inspiration which set the seal of heavenly origin to her faith and rituals, and characterize her priesthood as the legitimate succession of Christ and his apostles! It not being our purpose however to decide on the merits of the claims thus made, we shall proceed to consider the similarity of feature which the various creeds present on the subject of

THE ATONEMENT.

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith thus explicitly sets forth the doctrine:

"5. The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath fully satisfied the justice of his Father; and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto him."—p. 44.

"3. Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf. Yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for any thing in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice, and rich grace of God, might be glorified in the justification of sinners."—pp. 55—56.

"Q. 38. Why was it requisite that the Mediator should be God? A. It was requisite that the Mediator should be God, that he might sustain and keep the human nature from sinking under the infinite wrath of God, and the power of death; give worth and efficacy to his sufferings, obedience,

and intercession; and to satisfy God's justice, procure his favor, purchase a peculiar people, give his Spirit to them, conquer all their enemies, and bring them to everlasting salvation."

The Baptist Creed (page 30 & 36) holds precisely the same language. The Episcopal and Methodist Churches unite in the following statement of their views on this point:

"Art. 31. *Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.*—The offering of Christ once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone."

In addition to what is here given, it is the generally received opinion that a *vicarious sacrifice* was offered in the person of Christ—for the purpose of satisfying the claims of God's justice, vindicating his violated law, placating his wrath and reconciling offended Deity to his creatures. So far as we are certified, there is not a shadow of difference on this point. It is, moreover, a sentiment common to them all, that the violation of the law of God by the sinner involves *infinite* guilt, or that sin is infinite in character, and that the atonement to remove the same must likewise be infinite, and therefore the work of an infinite Being. Thus the *proper Deity* of Christ is proven by legitimate conclusions from *false* premises.

JUDGMENT DAY IN ETERNITY.

This is another dogma of the Church concerning which there is a perfect agreement in faith, between the Catholic and the various partial Protestant sects. Says the former,

"We must believe that Jesus Christ will come from heaven at the last day to judge us all; that all the dead, both good and bad, shall rise from their graves at the sound of the last trumpet, and shall be judged by him according to their works."

Says the Presbyterian Confession of Faith—

"God hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father. In which day, not only the apostate angels shall be judged; but likewise all

persons, that have lived upon earth, shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil."—pp. 135—136.

"Immediately after the resurrection shall follow the general and *final judgment* of angels and men."—*Ans Q.* 88.

And the "Apostle's Creed," (so called) used by the Episcopalian worshipper, says that Christ

"Was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven; and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to *judge* the *quick* and the *dead.*"

On the same point, the Baptist professor coincides exactly with the faith of the Presbyterian before quoted. In fact, if *unity of faith* be a desirable thing, it can be found among all Trinitarian sects on this subject. So likewise in relation to two other tenets, which are the last we shall bring to the notice of the reader, at this time—to wit:

A PERSONAL DEVIL AND ENDLESS HELL.

And who does not know the vast importance that is placed upon these doctrines by nearly all the Clergy of the day? They form in truth the main pillars of what is called "Orthodoxy," in these our times. Remove these pillars in the temple of *partialism*, and her time-honored walls and venerable arches would crumble to the earth. Here indeed is the platform on which those of conflicting views on minor points can meet in amity and peace. Here is a sort of *neutral ground*, whereon the spiritual belligerents of the age may meet and ground their arms, of late directed against each other, and form an alliance offensive and defensive against the heretical Ephraimites, whom they look upon as the common enemy. The Calvinist and the Arminian, the Protestant and the Catholic may here take each other by the hand, in token of fraternal fellowship, and, like Herod and Pilate of old, make a treaty of friendship, dictated alike by a community of faith, sympathy and interest. The one grand hailing sign of *endless damnation*, passes from rank to rank, and by

its cabalistical influence harmonizes the discordant elements of sectarism and forms the commingling hosts into an *united* and determined phalanx.

Nor is there a vastly greater difference to be discovered between the *customs* and *traditions* of the Mother Church and those of her daughters, than is found to exist between them in *doctrine*. The hue and cry of Protestants on this subject, is not unlike that of the rogue who bawls vociferously "stop thief," in order to divert the attention of pursuers from the real culprit. They would fain impress the idea upon the public mind that some awful danger is to be apprehended from the diffusion of Catholic customs and opinions, while they, good souls, are infinitely removed from the least suspicion of heresy in theory or corruption in practice. All this may be so, but we are not blessed with the right kind of vision to perceive the moral distinction which many affect to point out to us between Catholic and Protestant actions, when those actions are the result of the same opinions and the offspring of a similar creed. We never could see the propriety of allowing our minds to be so warped by prejudice, as to imagine that any remarkable variance of conduct could arise from the reception and practice of the same views on any subject, for a like cause will invariably produce like effects. If therefore we find the same spirit prevail, though under a different aspect, we should judge accordingly, without reference to names of obloquy which partizan zeal may conjure up to serve its purpose. That which is *wrong* in Catholic devotees, cannot, we may rest assured, be *right* in Protestant zealots, for right and wrong are not to be estimated after this fashion, else, are the eternal principles of rectitude as mutable as the wind that bloweth. Let us then candidly look at the objections which the Protestant sects urge against the Catholics, in order to ascertain whether the former are indeed of that happy number, who condemn not others in the things which they allow themselves. And *first*, let us take into consideration the principle of

INFALLIBILITY.

The Catholics claim that their church is the oldest, (which all will admit,) and that it is derived, by regular succession, from Christ and his apostles, through the various Roman Pontiffs to the present day, presenting a *unity* of faith and concert of action, which betoken its divine origin and continued purity. Well, is not the same pretension visible in every Protestant church in the land? Do not all claim for themselves the true faith and practice—consider themselves *orthodox* and those who differ from them *heterodox?* And is it not a very common circumstance to find this exclusive feeling manifest itself in the actions of various churches of the age. A dozen or two individuals unite in a religious capacity, and adopt a certain faith, to which they pledge themselves to conform. They then consider themselves *the Church* of Christ, and of course feel that its interests are confided to their charge, and that to them belongs the right of keeping it clear of heresy in opinion and immorality in practice. In this situation of affairs, suppose one of their number openly departs from the faith of the majority—what course is pursued in his case? Why, he is "dealt with," or submitted to church discipline, forthwith, and is "cast out of the synagogue" by *vote*, if found guilty of the error charged. Thus this little band of believers—self constituted as they are—proclaim to the world that the majority cannot err in the matter; or, in other words, they say to the delinquent, *we*, the Church, are *right* and *you* are *wrong*. And if the confidence and authority with which these things are managed, do not prove the claim of *infallibility* on their part, we confess ourselves ignorant of the meaning of the word.

And *second*; so likewise in reference to the objection of Protestants against the Pope as the Spiritual Head of the Church.

It is very much against their consciences to allow any such authority, and they look with contempt upon what they would call *spiritual cowardice* in the members of the Catholic communion, in submitting to such ecclesiastical domination. But at the same time, these very same objectors hesitate not to place

themselves under the spiritual control of Pastors, Teachers, Bishops and Elders, and give themselves unreservedly up to their guidance. The fact is palpable, that there is scarcely a Parish Priest, Deacon, Class-leader, Bishop, Elder or Preacher in the land who is not virtually a *Pope*, so far as his jurisdiction extends. The power of each of these is often that of a petty sovereign in his own territory, in the days of Feudal vassalage.—They "say to one go, and he goeth, and to another come, and he cometh," and woe, woe to the obstinate professor who dares resist the mandates of his rulers. In some churches, moreover, these rulers are multiplied, and a system of drill discipline is adopted, which serves well to steal power from the many and lodge it in the hands of a few. For instance, the Methodist Church has Class Leaders, Local Preachers, Stewards, Circuit Preachers. Presiding Elders and Bishops, besides Local and General Conferences, to the authority of most if not all of whom the private member submits his walk and conscience! Well, how much better is this system than that of the Catholic? For ourselves, we have not the least hesitation in saying, that when we bring our mind to the point of acknowledging the right of any one to lord it over our conscience, we should prefer much to have *one* Pope than half a dozen. And it matters not whether the officers of Protestant Churches *claim* the authority which a Pope does or not, so long as they *virtually* exercise it, its danger to the liberties of the people is by no means lessened.

Third, The right of *private judgment* in matters of faith and duty, and the privilege of reading the Bible for themselves, is contended for by Protestants with all earnestness, and, we think, correctly. It is indeed a privilege worth contending for by every freeman. But do Protestant sects act out the principle? Do they allow this right of private judgment to the people? True, they place the Bible in our hands and exhort us to read it, but are there no penalties annexed to the *crime* of not giving the same interpretation to it that the minister does? Is there not a sword of priestly vengeance hanging over our heads, by a single hair, to keep our minds from

wandering from the gloss which the church has put upon the sacred oracles? Else why so many trammels on Christians in the way of Creeds and Confessions? Why are men excommunicated for want of proper understanding of the Word, or for drawing therefrom doctrines adverse to popular theology? An answer to these queries will prove, that however much the people may imagine they have a right to judge for themselves in religious concerns, they have it under such restrictions as completely to nullify the privilege. But few dare, at least, to *express* their opinions unless they find themselves in the strong current which leadeth to the port of fashionable worship.

Fourth, Catholics hold to forgiveness of sin by the Priest and absolution from its penalties, by what are called *indulgences*. So do Protestants, as per following extract;

Of Church Censures.—The Lord Jesus, as king and head of his church, hath therein appointed a government in the hand of church-officers, distinct from the civil magistrate.

2. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require."—*Con. of Faith, Chap.* 30.

Here all that was ever claimed by Catholics is contended for by Presbyterians—and more—for absolution by the Catholic Priest does not extend to the "guilt or pain *eternal* due to it," but only "such temporal punishment as remains due after the guilt is remitted—those indulgences being nothing else than a mitigation a relaxation of the canonical penances enjoined by the church on penitent sinners, according to their several degrees of merit."—(*Doyle's Ed. Manual of Catholic piety p.* 322,) but the Protestant faith goes a step further. By the very convenient doctrine of death-bed repentances, so often practically set forth in the conversion of convicts in prison or under the gallows—the ministers *absolve* the most hardened wretches from all future and *eternal* punish-

ment, and give them a passport from a dungeon's gloom to heaven's glory, and this too, after they have *enjoyed* the "*pleasures* of *sin*" unpunished and unrecompensed, for a long lifetime! Besides, do not the Partialist Clergy often set themselves up as the vice-gerents of the Most High, and as intercessors between offended Deity and guilty sinners? And is not the promise frequently given to the unconverted of their getting a pardon for their sins, if they will only come forward to the "anxious seat," and the "altar," to be prayed for by God's ministers? The idea certainly is entertained and enforced, that the prayers of the Clergy are of great avail in absolving sinners from the guilt of sin, and converting them to God; and any one who would avow his preference to have his sins forgiven on application to God himself, without the intervention of the priesthood, would doubtless be deemed a scoffing infidel and so denounced. The claim of the Protestant Clergy therefore to "retain or remit sins," or to "shut the kingdom of heaven against the impenitent or open it to the penitent," cannot justly be denied—and hence they are in the same condemnation which they pronounce upon their Catholic neighbors.

Fifth, The doctrine of the "*real presence*" of Christ in the Eucharist, is denounced as a mischievous Catholic sentiment, and the *sacrifice* of the *mass* as an impious custom. But the first idea is thus explained in the Manual before quoted from.

"Christ is not present in this sacrament, according to his natural way of existence, that is, with extension of parts, &c. but in a *supernatural* manner: one and the same in many places: his presence, therefore, though real and substantial, is, *sacramentally*, not exposed to the external senses or obnoxious to corporal contingencies."

In this light, if we mistake not, Protestants look upon the sacrament of the Lord's supper.—The bread and wine are *symbols* of the broken body and blood of Christ—thus showing that they understand the words of our Saviour, "take eat, *this is my body*," and drink, "*this is my blood*," in a fig-

urative and not a literal sense. The difference then, is not important enough to unchristianize the Catholics, unless the rule works both ways.

Sixth, Catholics worship Images and believe in Purgatory, say the Protestants. But such is not the case so far as the first item is concerned. In the 11th article of their principles the charge is denied in plain terms, as follows:

"Catholics *renounce* all divine worship and adoration of images or pictures. God alone we worship and adore, nevertheless we place pictures in our churches to reduce our wandering thoughts and excite our memory towards heavenly things," &c.

And as to the second item—that of Purgatory—why complain of its erroneous character, when, manifestly, it is a more benevolent sentiment than is found in most Protestant creeds. According to the Catholic doctrine, there is a place of purification for those who have committed venial sins, or who have died with sins not fully repented of. But not so with Protestant Trinitarians, for their endless hell is equally the doom of the veteran in crime and the novitiate. The child who commits but one sin, after arriving at years of discretion or knowledge of good and evil, and dies without repenting thereof, is consigned to the same pit of perdition that awaits the obstinate and abandoned culprit! So their creeds teach—while the more merciful Mother Church provides an intermediate state of corrective discipline. Who will then say that the Protestant Faith is any better than the Catholic?

The truth is, that Luther and the early reformers, so called, never waged war against the *Doctrines* of Catholics, but against their abuse of power and their numerous traditional customs; and, as we have seen, those who have protested against what they deemed errors in the Mother Church, have virtually fallen into the same courses. Even the sword of persecution, which had been so fatally used for ages by Popes and Councils, when wrested from their grasp, was by no means suffered to rest in its scabbard, but has ever since been bathed in the blood of victims "for conscience' sake."

Witness the persecutions during the reign of the Protestant Queen Mary, and of the Protestant King James, and the Presbyterian Parliament, &c. in England. Look too at the persecutions in our own land, of one Protestant sect against another. The sufferings of the Baptists and Quakers from the hands of the Puritans of New England, were almost incredible. The Methodists too in their infancy were subjected to all manner of reproach and scorn—but now that they have grown to the stature of a man, and have obtained power, how easy have they slidden into the same excesses which have marked the reign of every dominant sect in Christendom! Alas! how true is the voice of Prophecy—"*As is the mother, so is her daughter.*"

Reader, the sum of the whole matter is this. However Protestants and Catholics may differ on unessential points of doctrine and practice, there is a perfect agreement between them on all the important topics of Theology. The creeds of all those spoken of in this chapter, are *partial* in their character and limited in their results. They unite in the worship of a God of *partial* love to his creatures, and who will eventually crown only a *part* of his offspring with his everlasting salvation. They all "limit the Holy One of Israel," and are therefore justly entitled to the distinctive appellation of *Limitarians* or *Partialists*. As it regards the *final destiny of man*, they are *one* in opinion, and may therefore be regarded as ONE Church and ONE People. Opposed to them in sentiment are all those, of whatever name, who believe in the "restitution of *all* things," or the final holiness and happiness of *all* mankind, and who are hence denominated *Universalists*. Thus there are in truth but "two opinions" in the Church. Our work then is plain before us. In opposing *Partialism*, we oppose the various *Creeds* of the age which involve the dogma of *endless misery* for a part of the human race. Having reduced the opposition to a *unit*, on a *major* proposition, so we succeed in proving *it* fallacious and contrary to the word of God, we shall care but little what becomes of the *minor* principles involved in the contest. To all would

we say, in the language of Wisdom of old—"Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of men. * * * Hear, for I will speak of excellent things, and the opening of my lips shall be right things—for my mouth shall speak *truth*."

CHAPTER II.

Proofs, from the nature and perfections of the Supreme Being; from reason and Scripture, in favor of the ultimate holiness and happiness of ALL MEN.

"*Produce your cause, saith the Lord, bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob.*"—Isaiah.

The only formula of Faith which has ever been adopted by the Universalists, in their denominational capacity, is the following concise statement of belief, as laid down by the General Convention of Universalists of the New England States, (now the U. S. General Convention.) Professing, as they do, to go to the Bible for their creed, and acting fully on the Protestant doctrine of the RIGHT of PRIVATE INTERPRETATION of the Sacred Oracles, they have not thought it necessary or expedient to establish a "Confession of Faith" and require a conformity thereto, on the part of those who attach themselves to the order. It is believed, however, that there is as perfect unanimity of sentiment among Universalists touching the articles subjoined, as can be found, upon any subject among any class of professing Christians. Let the reader candidly judge whether this statement of Faith is most worthy of condemnation for its heresy, or praise for its simplicity and beauty.

"PROFESSION OF BELIEF."

"*Article* 1.—We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of

God, and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind.

Article 2.—We believe that there is *One* God, whose nature is *Love*, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of Grace; who will finally *restore the whole family of mankind* to holiness and happiness.

Article 3.—We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected, and that *believers* ought to be careful to maintain order and practice good works, for these things are good and profitable unto men."

To the support of the *distinguishing* feature of the system thus briefly presented, to wit: the final "*restitution of all things*" will the present chapter be devoted. And we shall aim rather to offer a *summary* of the evidence in favor thereof, than to carry out the proofs in detail, or extend them to their utmost results. Let the reader therefore deliberately weigh each argument in the scale of impartial judgment, and, if seen to be based on sound premises, let him follow out to the conclusions necessarily flowing therefrom, however much these may conflict with long cherished opinions or deeply rooted impressions. Let him, for once cast off the manacles of mind, disenthrall his intellect from the weight of prejudice "which so easily besets it" and give wings to the thoughts of the heart, as they come gushing forth from their inmost recesses. Then, and not till then, will the truth of heaven shed its divine radiance upon the soul, and awaken its torpid powers to new life, health and vigor.

Argument 1st.—The *nature* of the Supreme Being is *Love*. This is the very *essence* of Deity. "God is Love," saith the voice of inspiration, and "God is Love," is the response which is echoed back from the vaulted heavens, from the "deep, deep sea," and the uttermost parts of the creation of the Most High. This principle being the sum and substance of the Divine Existence—the focus in which all the qualities and attributes of Jehovah concentrate—it follows, as a matter of positive conclusion, that none of the operations of such a Being can be characterized by a different influence.

Infinite *Love* cannot bring forth the work of infinite *hatred*, inasmuch as every cause produces its like. Nor can these two opposite principles ever be identified as one and the same cause, producing precisely the same results. Love, moreover, is a vital, quickening and active sentiment, ever seeking the good of the object of it, ever employed in devising means to promote the felicity of its subjects and exercising its energies in securing the desired purpose. It is also a truth, which will not be questioned, that "Love worketh no ill to its neighbor," nay, "thinketh no evil." How then can it be supposed that an *infinite evil* could ever have been the suggestion much less the contrivance of infinite and unlimited Benevolence! How can it be believed that a God, *all Love*, could be satisfied at beholding a wide-spread and deeply malignant influence to prevail in his universe, which, by its very existence, aims a fatal blow at his own most holy nature. We hold it be an indisputable proposition, that *endless misery* is an *ultimate* and *absolute evil*, and that such an evil cannot exist in the presence of Infinite *Love*, without coming in conflict therewith, and terminating in the most disastrous results to the whole machinery of creation. The supposition indeed that a created thing can be co-equal in duration with the Creator is no less preposterous and absurd, than that infinite benevolence could devise and produce its opposite—an endless evil. An impure stream cannot flow from a pure fountain. A good tree will not bear evil fruit. No man gathers grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. Neither can infinite hatred, wrath and cruelty ever be the legitimate fruits which result from unlimited Love. As plain then as are these truths, so plain is it that *Universal Love* must bring about *universal happiness*. God's Love is infinite—of course *all* his creatures must be the subjects of its influence, and that influence will not cease to be exercised, until its purpose is fully accomplished in the restoration of *all* from the bondage of ignorance and spiritual death, to a state of unalloyed enjoyment and peace in his most glorious presence.

2. The salvation of all men is consistent with *Divine Goodness*, one of the leading attributes of Deity. No one will deny that a Supremely Perfect Being possesses the attribute of goodness in an infinite degree. If God then be infinitely good, he must be good to all, and every operation of this divine principle must tend to the happiness of the whole of his creation. It was this goodness, we may reasonably suppose, which first induced the Almighty to stretch forth his hand and call man into existence. God being essentially Perfect and necessarily happy, in and of himself, could not have wanted such a creation to add to his unspeakable fulness. He is "not worshipped with mens hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all, life, and breath, and all things." This being the case, we can conceive of no other motive operating with Deity, in the work of creating a Universe, than a desire to impart a portion of his own boundless felicity. It was simply the goings forth of his benevolent nature—the emanations of his love, which moulded inert and unoffending matter into a form of symmetry and beauty, and infused into the same the breath of life. All must admit that God had some design in creation, and that this design was *good* will not be questioned for a moment.—It follows, as a necessary inference, that the goodness of God is engaged in the work of universal holiness and happiness. This attribute cannot purpose evil—it must purpose good.—Hence we conclude that all partial evil which now exists in the world will eventually be over-ruled in mercy and swallowed up in the superabundant goodness of Jehovah. "God is good to *all* and his tender mercies are over *all* his works? "Oh! taste and see, that the Lord is good."

3. The *wisdom* and *knowledge* of Deity are no less pledged for the welfare of man than his goodness. "*Known* unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world." This omniscience could have marked out a plan of operation for himself which would take in all the circumstances and events of futurity, and guard effectually against all accident or defeat. He who "calleth those things which be not, as

though they were," and in whose sight all eternity is present as a thing of to-day, was surely capable of devising the best plan for the accomplishment of his own purposes; and it will not be pretended that he would select, as the best, one which he certainly *knew* would result in failure and disappointment, for that would amount to the declaration that a Supremely *wise* Being could do a very *foolish* act! God's wisdom then being infinite, his knowledge is infallible.—What he *knows* is as much a matter of certainty as his own existence. He can neither be ignorant nor foolish. Hence the conclusion, in connexion with the proceeding argument, that the attribute of ommiscience must have devised a method, in consonance with the suggestions of divine goodness, which will infallibly secure the object in view. This object, the *happiness* of the creature, is then as sure of fulfilment as that there is any harmony betwen these respective attributes. We know that it is asserted that God's knowledge of any event, yet future to us, is not necessarily connected with his contrivance thereof, or in other words, that God knows some things as certain and some as contingent. By which last phrase is meant, that there are some things which Deity has poised upon the freedom of the human will, and which he *does not know* or *does not choose* to *know* with sufficient definiteness to amount to absolute certainty! But such views of infinite wisdom are worse than puerile—they are absurd. For instance; suppose that the salvation of the human race is one of those events which God knows as possible or contingent. He places man in certain circumstances—endows him with certain passions and propensities—gives him a freedom to choose and refuse, and leaves him to his fate. The event—salvation—however, which God knew as contingent, does not take place, but its reverse—damnation! In such a case, did God *know* what was true or false? The latter, most unquestionably; manifestly then to say that God knows some things only as contingent, is virtually to affirm that he has no knowledge whatever on the subject.—He is not more wise than man, according to this scheme, for the latter usually knows something of events *after they have*

transpired! But away with such sophisms, which would annihilate the infinite knowledge of God, in order to preserve unimpaired the inconsistent "creeds and commandments of men" He "whose eye never sleeps," and the range of whose vision is co-extensive with his own immensity, hath not put the eternal interests of his creatures beyond his ken or placed them upon "the hazard of a die." The infallibility of his knowledge will secure the end designed by infinite goodness.

4 The infinite *Power* of God can bring to a successful issue his purposes of Love towards the human family. Between the several attributes of Jehovah, there must, moreover, be a perfect harmony of design and concert of action, or else disatisfaction and discord will ensue in the eternal councils, and imperfection must be allowed there to exist.—"A house divided against itself cannot stand." We therefore are compelled to admit that the *power* of the Almighty will be called into exercise in obedience to this sovereign will and pleasure. What *goodness* suggests will be consummated by the *power* of God, according to the plans of his *wisdom.* That Deity *can* do all that we believe he will accomplish is not however disputed. His might, it is conceded, is able to do its work and "none can stay his hand." But this is in a *physical* sense. *Morally,* it is supposed, God is *unable* to do every thing he might otherwise do. He cannot deny himself. He cannot save the sinner except on his own terms. He cannot forget the claims of his honor and justice and the dignity of his laws. He cannot force the creature to accept his mercy and grace. All this is granted, if you please, and what then? No one pleads for the exercise of God's physical power to perform moral impossibilities. Nevertheless, the moral power of God can do all for which we ask by moral means; and we have the assurance too, that the people of God "shall be willing in the day of his power." Let us hear no more then about Jehovah hedging himself about with difficulties which he cannot remove, as such notions are unworthy the character of an Almighty and Allwise Divinity.

5. The *immutability* of Jehovah is a strong proof of the accomplishment of his original purposes of mercy towards a world of mankind. The Almighty is unchangeable in his nature and in his purposes. "He is of one mind and none can turn him." "With him is no variableness or shadow of turning." "I am the Lord, I change not," saith he, by the mouth of his prophet. This immutability secures the plans of Deity from fluctuation or alteration. It falsifies the opinion that the evil deeds of men have compelled him to devise a new and different system of providence from that originally instituted. It denies the possibility of God being to day a God of Love and to-morrow a Being of wrath. It renders it certain that infinite benevolence can never change to implacable hatred. If God then is Love, he must ever have been so, and will ever so remain. If God ever loved the the creature he will always love him. If the sinner was ever the object of divine benevolence, from that Love nothing shall ever be able to separate him, "neither heighth, nor depth, things present, nor things to come, nor any other creature." The eternal Truth of Jehovah is pledged to bless his creatures, and "God is not a man that he should lie, or the Son of man that he should repent; Hath he said it, and shall he not do it? Hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" How strange indeed is it, that an Almighty, self-existent and independent Being should be supposed to be so influenced by the acts of his creatures, as one moment to be blown into a whirlwind of wrath, and the next, to be placified into kindness and compassion! The thing is impossible.

6. The salvation of all men is consistent with the *justice* of God. This justice has for its object the removal of every thing which is opposed to the rectitude of the divine nature. It is set to preserve the law of God from violation and to restore it when broken. It is appointed to bring back the wayward and unjust and unrighteous creature to a state of virtue, justice and righteousness, or to make him pure and holy and just. And how can these objects ever be accomplished on any other supposition than universal holiness and happiness? To send the sinner to an endless hell would on-

ly be *perpetuating* him in injustice and unholiness, instead of purifying and reforming him. For the unjust to be sentenced to everlasting perdition would only ensure the *continued violation* of the *law* of God, and forever make it impossible for God's justice to be satisfied. By the supposition aforesaid this attribute of Deity is, moreover, entirely destroyed. It has claims on the sinner which can never, by the nature of the case, be fully cancelled. The inflictions of its penalty are being constantly endured, but without advancing a single step towards the satisfaction it demands! We have not so learned the matter. On the contrary, God's justice must be satisfied—his law of love must be fulfilled in every iota, and this being accomplished, it follows as a truth of mathematical certainty, that no unjust being will continue to exist in the universe, but that all will be brought into willing obedience to the law of love divine.

7. God's *holiness* will secure universal holiness among the creatures of his power. This perfection cannot be content always to look upon sin and unholiness, but must operate to the removal, finally, of every thing which is radically opposed to its own nature. God's hatred of sin will effect the removal of it from his dominions, and his love for sinners will cause him to deliver them from the thraldom of iniquity. So, at least, we judge, unless it can be made to appear that a Being of perfect holiness will suffer a hateful thing always to exist in his presence, when he had the power to remove it. Let it be remembered too that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." When then it is discovered by what process God can make *any* of his sinful creatures fit subjects of his kingdom, by the same process may *all* eventually be prepared for the like destiny.

8. The salvation of all men is consistent with the *glory* of Jehovah. The declarative glory of God is supposed to have been one of the designs of the creation of man. As saith the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, "Man's chief end is to *glorify* God and enjoy him forever." Allowing this to be true, in what way can man best fulfil this end of his creation? Let the Psalmist answer the question: "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me," (Ps. l. 23.) Of the same purport is the language

of Christ to his disciples, in John xv. 8.—"Herein is my Father *glorified* that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples," and again, in Math. v. 16, he exhorts them to "let their light so shine before men, that others seeing their good works may *glorify* their Father who is in heaven." Accordingly, the Christian life best exhibits the glory of God. The branches of the vine which bear much fruit best shew forth the character of the parent stalk, and those who abide in Christ, who is the choice vine, and are nourished and protected under the benign influence of his grace and gospel, will produce much of the fruits of righteousness. Thus will the praise or Glory of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ be most richly displayed by the creatures he has made. Inseparably connected, however, with the exhibition of "good works," with the bearing "much fruit" and the offering of praise and thanksgiving, is the *happiness* of those who are thus employed. If any are forever miserable, *they* cannot give praise to the Author of their existence. The emotion of gratitude is not enkindled on the altar of the heart, unless in return for favors received and blessings enjoyed. Nor can the *sinner*, who continues in his rebellion, declare the glory of his Maker,, for an Apostle has said, "we have *all sinned* and *come short* of the *glory* of God,"—implying, that as far as men have sinned, so far have they failed to exhibit the excellence and praise of their Creator; and also, that those who are sinners forever, (if such there be, as the doctrine of endless misery suppose,) will forever fail to ensure the end of their creation, which was to "glorify God." Now, if this be true, there has been some failure in the purposes of the Almighty! He has been disappointed in one of his objects in creation, and instead of hearing the triumphant shout of a ransomed universe, proclaiming "*Glory* to God *in the highest*," the dolorous groans, lamentations and blasphemies of damned spirits re-echo his *inglorious* defeat throughout the dark and dismal caverns of hell! But such an event is impossible. On the contrary, we have the assurance that *universal* praise shall be paid to the Most High. "*All* thy works shall praise thee, Oh Lord."

9. Universal salvation is in accordance with the *impartiality* of God's benevolence as displayed throughout his works. No where in nature are there traces of a partial God. The sun of heaven shines alike upon the evil and the good—and the rains and dews distil equally upon the just and the unjust. The common blessings of Providence are enjoyed by high and low, rich and poor. All are brought into the world under similar circumstances of natural endowment and possessed of the same means of physical enjoyment. All are fed at the same table—tread the same variegated carpet spread out before them—breathe the same air, and walk under the same glorious star-spangled and jewel-decked firmament. "The eyes of all wait upon thee, and thou givest them their meat in due season. Thou openest thy hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing." If therefore, God has been impartial in his temporal blessings, why may we not suppose that he will be equally so in the distribution of the "riches of his grace." To use the language of another, "if there is no partiality in the primary and essential gift of existence; in life considered as a whole; in the minor properties and felicities of our natures; in our senses; in our intellectual and moral faculties; in the gratification, of which they are respectively the source; if all these great blessings agree in this important circumstance that they are instruments of enjoyment to all, it must follow that there is no partiality in the distribution of moral and spiritual good."

10. From the *nature* of *man* a substantial argument is derived, in favor of his ultimate restoration to holiness and happiness. He is the last and most perfect work of the Almighty, is endowed with superior powers and faculties, made capable of communing with the author of his existence, and to him has been given dominion and superiority over all the rest of the creatures which inhabit the earth. Take this fact in connexion with the admission, that all things of an inferior order to men answer the precise purpose for which they were created, and it will be difficult to conceive why

mankind should fail of the legitimate ends of their existence. God has completed the whole of his work in a perfect manner, even to the formation of the smallest insect that flutters in the breeze. He has not left any part of his creation to receive a *finishing* touch from the hand of his offspring. All is just as Omnipotent wisdom contrived and designed, and cannot be made better by finite skill. Why then is it thought, that a being of so exhalted a rank as man, in the scale of existence, should not answer the purpose of his formation? It cannot be, that the most noble of God's workmanship should utterly dissappoint his intentions, when all else fulfilled the same. . He that clotheth the lilies of the field in beauty, and heareth the young ravens when they cry, will not suffer his rational offspring to perish, for lack of his guardian watchfulness and care. He who noticeth the fall of a sparrow to the ground, and who numbereth the very hairs of our heads, will not permit any ultimate evil to happen to those creatures who are of infinitely more value in his sight than many sparrows.

11. From the nature and design of all just *punishment* do we deduce a strong argument in favor of the "restitution of all things." The true object of punishment is the *correction* of the evil doer. When a parent inflicts chastisement, it is not with a design to torture the offender, but to amend and reform him. When a master punishes his servant, it is with the same object in view. So likewise with all good governments—the chief and primary object of penal inflictions is the *reformation* of those who violate the obligations of civil law. Without this design, punishment becomes *revenge;* it is the giving of pain, not with the laudable purpose of correcting the evil doer, but with a view to gratify a malignant disposition. Now, suppose an earthly parent were to inflict chastisement upon a disobedient child, through the impulse of passion or malicious feeling, without having in view the reformation of the culprit, would he not be esteemed a cruel, hard-hearted tyrant, unworthy the name of man? Surely he would. The moment parental chastisement becomes excessive, or is inflicted through improper motives, it excites our deepest abhorence. But let a parent punish a

child with a view to correct it of some depraved disposition, and he will be applauded for the act. He does as a just and merciful parent should do, who has at heart the welfare of his offspring. His *love* for them prompts him to punish, not with a desire to see them endure pain, but with a view to bring about a good and necessary object. If such therefore be true principles with men, we ought not to suppose that Deity is governed by a worse motive. If it is love that should prompt an earthly parent to punish his offspring, we cannot suppose that God will punish his creatures, from an opposite principle. We are assured, on the contrary, that "the Lord loveth whom he chasteneth and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth," and that "unto the Lord belongeth *mercy*, because he rendereth to every man according to his works." We are also certified of the object of God's chastisements. "For our profit," saith the Apostle, "that we may *afterwards* bring forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness." And on no other system than universal reformation, can this object of punishment be gained. The idea of endless suffering excludes it, because the *afterwards* will never come. There is *no end* to the infliction of pain, according to this dogma; consequently there is no period, when the punished can be brought to the happy result—that of "bringing forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness."

Nor can it be pretended that the sufferings of a future state can be an *example* to deter men from the commission of crime in this life. That which is set forth *as an example*, must, of course, *be seen*, in order for it to have its due weight, which is clearly not the case with the supposed torments of an endless hell. No one has come back from the world of spirits to testify concerning such a doom for man, and hence it is a matter not realized by any transgressor, because of its uncertainty and remoteness. Besides, it is a well known principle that a prompt, certain, and present punishment is of far more efficacy in the prevention of crime, than a distant and uncertain retribution. The word in the Greek translated *punishment*, moreover, favors the idea we have advanced. That word is *kolazin*, and literally signifies *pruning* or correcting. The pruning of trees, as every one

knows, has for its object their thrift and better products. So of the primary idea of punishment. It is to amend, correct or reform—which object can never be accomplished, either by destroying the subject of it, or inflicting upon him an irremediable and unending pain.

12. The doctrine of universal blessedness is agreeable to the best and most holy *desires* of the human heart. Every humane and benevolent man must wish for the happiness of the whole race of Adam. It is the earnest desire of every philanthropic bosom that the pains of the suffering and the sorrows of the distressed shall at length find alleviation.—The common sympathies of our nature prompt us to put forth our best exertions to make glad the pathway of the forlorn and wretched, and wipe the tear from the weeping eye. Our most holy aspirations are breathed for the welfare of those who are bowed down and disconsolate. The Christian, too, is ardently engaged in the work of mercy and kindness, thus testifying to the benevolent nature of his soul's desires. Having felt the Love of God shed abroad in his heart, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, he is deeply solicitous that every one of his race should rejoice in the same blessings and experience the same joys with himself.—And shall these benevolent desires and holy aspirations never be satisfied! Has God implanted all these feelings in the human heart, only to mock his creatures with hopes that never can be realized, and with wishes which must ever remain ungratified? We cannot so believe. He who formed the heart and there enkindled those pure and ennobling emotions which distinguish us as moral and social beings, must have designed their gratification. They are righteous emotions, and the word of God assures us that the "desires of the righteous shall be granted."

We now come to the more important part of our work, that of enquiring '*what saith the scriptures*' concerning the purposes of God in relation to the destiny of mortals. And here the proofs crowd so thickly on our pen, that we shall, of necessity, be obliged to study brevity, in order to compass

the whole within our prescribed limits. Let us then 'to the Law and to the Testimony,' and give heed to the evidence they present of the unfailing goodness of the Universal Parent. For greater facility of reference, we shall place these proofs under the distinct head of

UNIVERSALISM A BIBLE DOCTRINE.

PROOF 1.—'And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: * * * * so God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Genesis i. 26, 27. The moral character thus stamped upon man in creation proves the special care of Deity in this part of his handiwork, and forbids the supposition that creatures so honored by him should reflect their Maker's image forever in the liquid flames of Tophet!

2 'And God saw every thing which he had made, and behold it was *very good.* Gen. i. 31. If such was the verdict of infinite wisdom, it must be clear that an *endless hell* was no part of his work! 'Very good' could not have been pronounced upon such a specimen of creative skill, 'our enemies themselves being judges.'

3. 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and *breathed* into his nostrils the *breath* of life; and man became a living soul.' ii. 7. The *spirit* of man is therefore a portion of the breath of the Almighty. Will God suffer a portion of his own nature to endure unceasing torment?

4. '*In the day* thou eatest thereof, thou shalt *surely* die.' ii. 17. This text proves the *present* punishment of sin. In the day Adam sinned he suffered the *death* threatened—a moral or spiritual death—or there is no truth in the prohibition of the Almighty. Those who interpret this phrase differently, and contend that *in the day* means *in eternity* falsify the record, and make good the language of the Serpent who whispered 'ye shall not surely die,' as God had promised.

5. 'And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruize thy head, and thou shalt bruize his heel'. iii. 15. Jehovah thus pledg-

ed himself to the serpent, and the figure proves the utter destruction of the 'evil one,' as much as a bruize on the vital part of a reptile would ensure its death. The Serpent's power to harm, on the contrary, was only partial—'thou shalt bruize his *heel*'—that being the least vulnerable part of the human system.

6. 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake, * * * in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till* thou return to the ground.' iii. 17,19. This sentence of the Supreme Judge shows likewise the nature of the penalties he inflicts on his disobedient offspring. He did not wait to bring Adam to a judgment bar, in a future world, but called him to his judgment seat, forthwith, and expressly limited the consequences of his act to this life. Thorns and thistles were the unprofitable product to be gathered, and in the sweat of his face was he to eat bread, *till* he returned to the ground. We have no intimation of any other punishment in reserve for the delinquent, in eternity, and hence conclude, that there was none such.—Besides, it is a fair inference from the figurative language used in this connexion, that punishment is limited. Where men sow, there they will reap, and in the season immediately succeeding that in which the seed is sown. 'He who soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption.' As a planter who sows a crop in America would not expect to gather the same, years afterwards, in Europe; neither need he, who ploughs and sows the field of iniquity, here upon the earth, expect to reap the fruits thereof, in another world!

7. 'A fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be *in the earth.*' iv. 12. 'And Cain said unto the Lord, my punishment *is greater* than I can bear.' 13. Here we find that temporal punishment only was inflicted on the first murderer, and even that was mitigated on the supplication of the culprit.—God set a mark upon Cain, *lest* any finding him should slay him, and threatened *seven fold* vengeance upon any one who should take his life. If then Cain's crime deserved one endless hell, how could *seven fold* vengeance be taken on the one who should slay *him?*

8. 'I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me, and the earth.' ix. 13. This is typical of the covenant of grace in and through Jesus of Nazareth. The 'rainbow round about the throne' of God is as sure a pledge of spiritual blessings, as the bow in the cloud was a pledge of temporal good,—'seed time and harvest.'

9. 'In thee shall all *families* of the earth be blessed.' xii. 3.

10. 'By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, * * * 'and in thy seed shall the *nations* of the earth be blessed.' xxii. 16, 18; xviii. 18.

11. 'In thy seed shall all the *nations* of the earth be blessed'. xxvi. 4.

12. 'And in thy seed shall all the *families* of the earth be blessed.' xxviii. 14.

The *unconditional* promise thus given by Jehovah to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is the promise of the Gospel through Christ, (Gal. iii. 8.) and is full of blessing to all nations, families and kindreds of the earth. If any one is not thus connected, he may not be included in the general provision, but such an exception cannot be found.

13. 'And Joseph said unto them, Fear not, for I am in the place of God.' l. 19. The history of Joseph sets forth, in a striking light, the doctrine of divine forgiveness. He may be considered a type of the Saviour of the world. As he was the favorite son of his father, and was sent to look after his brethren—as they envied him and hated him—as they sold him in bondage and plotted his death; so was Christ the well-beloved Son of the Highest—so was he sent into the world to seek the good of his brethren, was hated without a cause, and finally betrayed for a few pieces of silver. But, as Joseph was subsequently exhalted to a rank, even to the second post of honor in the Kingdom of Pharaoh, and had all power given to him; and as he supplied all the wants of his brethren out of the storehouses of Egypt—so was Christ raised from the pit of degradation, and exhalted to the place of prime

minister in the court of heaven, and so did he make ample provision for the supply of all the spiritual wants of his brethren of the human race, forgave their transgressions against him, and hath engaged to bring about the subjection of every knee and the willing homage of every tongue, to the praise of God the Father.

14. 'Now these are the *judgments* which thou shalt set before them.' Exodus xxi. 1. An examination of these judgments which the Lord commanded Moses to set before the Israelites, as found recorded in this and succeeding chapters of Exodus, &c. will prove to a demonstration, that the punishments of the Almighty are all confined to the present state of existence. That *Law*, which was handed down to the people of Israel, amid the awful solemnities of the burning mount of Sinai, and sanctioned by the flash of heaven's lightnings and the roar of God's own artillery, severe and terrible as are the judgments there pronounced upon transgressors, does not contain a syllable touching the supposed retributions of eternity!

15. 'The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth.' Ex. xxxiv. 6. The character of Jehovah, thus proclaimed by himself, fully establishes the doctrine for which we contend; as endless misery could never have been the contrivance of such a Being. And when it is added, in the next verse, that he 'forgiveth iniquity, transgression and sin,' but 'will *by no means* clear the guilty,' we have positive proof of the *certainty* of punishment, and of its perfect compatibility with the *forgiveness* of *sin*;—and are assured, moreover, that forgiveness of *punishment* is not a doctrine of the Bible.

16. 'God is not a man that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent: hath he said and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken and shall he not make it good? behold I have received commandment to *bless* and *he hath blessed*, and I cannot reverse it.' Numbers, xxiii. 19, 20. The refusal of Balaam, the prophet, to curse the people of Israel, at the request of Balak, the King of Moab, saying, "How

shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?' is indirect proof that Jehovah hath not cursed any of his creatures with an endless curse. He hath promised to bless, and cannot change, repent, or deny himself. 'He is not a man that he should lie.'

17. The *blessings* and *curses* pronounced upon the children of Israel prove the temporary nature of 'rewards, and punishments'; See Deuteronomy, Chapter xxviii. 1, 68 — Also, the judgments of God as alluded to in verse 23 of the next chapter, and the dealings of Providence with the Antedeluvians, and other rebellious and wicked people of old.

18. 'He is the Rock, his work is perfect, all his ways are judgment.' Deut. xxxii. 4. The character here given to Deity, and the fact recorded that his work is perfect and his ways are judgment, are strong assurances of the fallacy of that doctrine which denies the present retributions for sin. And if God judges and punishes men *here*, will he mock them with another trial for the same offences, and inflict a second and more severe penalty, *hereafter?*

19. 'For a fire *is* kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the *lowest hell, and* shall *consume the earth* with her increase.' Deut. xxxii. 22. This proves that there was such a thing as "hell-fire" here upon the earth, in days of old, rendering it unecessary for us to suppose yet another such fire is to be kindled in eternity.

20 'Let us fall now into the hand of the Lord, for his mercies are great, and let me not fall into the hands of man.' ii. Samuel xxiv. 14. The benevolence of man *would* save the human race, if it *could*. God's benevolence being infinitely greater, and coupled with infinite power, must therefore ensure that which the former cannot accomplish. David's *wise* choice in preferring to fall into the hands of the Lord, because, his "mercies were great," is a sure pledge that Deity will not suffer any evil to exist, which the less merciful man, his creature, would not permit.

21. 'Ask of me, and I shall give thee the *heathen* for thine inheritance, and the *uttermost parts* of the *earth* for a pos-

session.' Psalm ii. 8. This is a solemn promise of the Almighty to give all things to his Son Jesus Christ.

22. 'All the ends of the world shall remember and return unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.' Ps. xxii. 27.

23. 'When my father and mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up.' Ps. xxvii. 10. Here we have the assurance that the love and compassion of Jehovah exceedeth that of earthly parents.

24. 'For his anger endureth but a moment.' Ps. xxx. 5.

25. 'Beautiful for situation, the *joy of the whole earth*, is Mt. Zion.' Ps. xlviii. 2. The Gospel covenant is termed *Mt. Zion*, in contra-distinction to the legal dispensation which answereth to *Mt. Sinai*, or "Jerusalem which was." The whole earth is embraced in the blessings of the former.

26. 'Verily he is a God that judgeth *in the earth*.' Ps. lviii. 11.

27. 'All the earth shall worship thee and sing unto thee.' Ps. lxvi. 4.

28. 'He that is our God is the God of salvation, and unto God the Lord, belong the issues from death.' Ps. lxviii. 20.

29. 'All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, Oh Lord.' Ps. lxxxvi. 9.

30. 'But thou, Oh Lord, art God *full* of compassion and gracious, long-suffering, and plenteous in mercy and truth.' Ps lxxxv. 15.

31. 'Then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes, nevertheless, my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, or suffer my faithfulness to fail.' Ps. lxxxix. 32, 33. This passage proves the *remedial* nature of God's chastisements.

32. 'Let the heavens rejoice and let the earth be glad, * * * * before the Lord, for he cometh, for he cometh. to *judge* the earth.' Ps. xcvi 11, 13: xcviii. 4, 9. The Psalmist speaks rapturously of God's coming to judge the earth. 'Make a joyful noise all the earth.' 'Let the floods clap their hands,' &c. But how differently would he have

spoken, had he believed that this coming was only the prelude to the almost universal woe of the human race? Methinks, the sweet singer of Israel would have 'hung his harp upon the willows,' and refused to touch its broken strings, had he realized, in vision, the awful solemnities, which, it is supposed, will be enacted at a 'Judgment day' in eternity! There could have been no cause, at least, for rejoicing, had such a view of God's judgments, as that now generally entertained, been present to the mind of this inspired penman.

33. 'For the Lord is good, his mercy is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations.' Ps. c. 5. This is the *foundation* of the call to give thanks. 'God hath made us;' 'we are his people and the sheep of his pasture,' therefore, 'make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye lands.' Now, unless God continues to be good, no one can fulfil the injunction thus based on his loving kindness.

34. 'The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger forever.' ps. ciii, 8, 9.

35. 'Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him.' ps. ciii, 13.

36. 'The glory of the Lord shall endure forever: the Lord shall rejoice in his works.' ps. civ, 31.

37. 'O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy endureth forever.' ps. cvi, 1.

38. 'Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.' ps. cx, 3.

39. 'His mercy endureth forever,' repeated 26 times in one chapter—ps. cxxxvi.

40. 'The Lord is good unto all, and his tender mercies are over all his works;' 'All thy works shall praise thee O Lord.' ps. cxlv. 9, 10.

41. 'Behold the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner.' Proverbs xi, 31. A recompense is payment in full—a reward according to the deed. If this recompense, therefore, is paid 'in the earth,' where is there any room for endless retribution?

42. 'Come now and let us reason together, saith the Lord:

though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.' Isaiah 1, 18. The radical change thus effected, goeth to show that sins of the deepst die will be washed out, by the all cleansing 'blood of the covenant.'

43. 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the tops of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.' Is. ii. 2.

44. 'Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end.' Is. ix. 7.

45. 'And in this mountain shall the Lord of Hosts make unto *all people* a feast of fat things.' Is. xxv. 6.

46. 'He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off *all* faces.' 8.

47. 'And the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away .' Is. xxxv. 10. It will be remembered, in this connexion, that Christ 'gave himself a ransom for *all*.'

48. 'And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.' Is. xl. 5.

49. 'Even every one that is called by my name; for I have created him for my glory.' xliii. 7. All are to be gathered from the east and west, north and south, and the Lord is to be with them.

50. 'Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I am God, and there is none else. I have *sworn* by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me *every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear*, surely shall say. In the Lord, have I righteousness and strength.' Is. xlv. 22, 24. Thus have we universal homage proven by the solemn oath of the Almighty.

51. 'My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure.' Is. xlvi. 10.

52. 'Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should

not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee.' Is xlix. 15. What a beautiful illustration of the undying nature of God's love! It far surpasseth the tenderest feelings of the most affectionate mother for her infant child! And who that knoweth the depth, and purity, and disinterestedness of maternal love, will doubt for a moment, its *entire* willingness to save; yet holy and pure and disinterested as is a mother's love, the love of God is greater. *He* will not forget the offspring he has created, though a mother *may* forget her child.

53. 'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who bringeth *good tidings*, that publisheth peace, that bringeth *good tidings* of good, that publisheth salvation.' Is lii. 7. This prophecy sets forth the nature of Christ's mission into the world. It is significantly expressive of the peaceful and joy-inspiring character of the gospel of salvation—the 'glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to *all* people.'

54. '*All* we like sheep have gone astray, ——— and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us *all*.' Is. liii. 6.

55. 'The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.' Is. liii. 10.

56. 'He shall see of the travail of his soul, and *shall* be *satisfied*.' Is. liii. 11. Will the Messiah be satisfied with any result, short of the salvation of all for whom he died? We think not.

57. 'Ho every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat, yea come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.' Is. lv. 1. The invitation being universal, God designed that *all* should participate, or else he was guilty of solemn mockery of those whom he *knew* would never drink at the 'fountain of living waters.'

58. 'So shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth, it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please and prosper in the thing whereunto I sent, it for ye shall go out with joy and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands.'

Is. lv. 11, 12. God's *pleasure* is, that all men shall be saved, or 'gathered together in Christ.' His word is therefore pledged to accomplish that which he pleaseth to bring about.

59. 'The whole of the 60th chapter of Isaiah sets forth the extent of the blessings of the Gospel. The "gentiles shall come to thy light and kings to the brightness of thy rising; 'violence shall no more be heard in thy land, * * * but thou shall call thy walls salvation and thy gates praise.' 'Thy people also shall be all righteous.'

60. 'The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the meek, he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.' Is. lxi. 1, 2, 3.

61. 'So the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring up before *all the nations*.' verse 11.

62. Doubtless, thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us and Israel acknowledge us not.' Is. lxiii. 16.

63. 'The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, * * * They shall not hurt nor destroy, in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.' Is. lxv. 25,

64. 'And behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. * * * After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts: and will be their God and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his brother, saying know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least of them, to the greatest of them, for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.' Jeremiah xxxi. 31 –34.

65. 'For the Lord will not cast off forever: But though he cause grief, yet will he have compassion, according to the multitude of his mercies. For he doth not afflict willingly the children of men.' Lam. iii. 31, 32, 33.

66. 'Behold *all souls* are mine.' Ezekiel xviii. 4.

67. The stone that smote the image, in Nebuchadnezzar's vision, was to 'fill *the whole earth*.' Daniel ii. 35, 44, 45.—

That stone was a representation of the kingdom of Christ.

58. 'I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man, came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him.—And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that *all* people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an *everlasting* dominion, which *shall not pass away*: and his kingdom that which *shall not be destroyed*.' Daniel vii. 14. If this language of Prophecy concerning the extent and duration of Christ's kingdom be true, where is there any reason to suppose, that 'many people, nations and languages' will serve the Devil, forever, in the kingdom of darkness!

69. 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction.' Hosea xiii. 14. The destruction of death and the grave (Sheol—*hell*) is thus predicted by the prophet.

70. 'Who is a God, like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity.' * * * he retaineth not his anger forever; because he delighteth in mercy' &c. Micah vii. 18, 20.

71. 'For the earth shall be *filled* with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.' Habakkuk. ii. 14.

72. 'And I will shake all nations, and the *desire of all nations* shall come.' Haggai ii. 7.

73. 'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles: and *in every place* incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord.' Malachi i. 11.

75. 'He is like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap.—And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver.' iii. 2, 3. The purpose of the coming of the 'Messenger of the covenant, even Jesus Christ, is here clearly set forth as a *purifier* and not a destroyer. The fire of the refiner is designed to purge out the alloy or dross from the ore, and bring forth the pure metal. The soap of the fuller is intended to cleanse the

cloth from oil and other impurities, and not to injure the texture of the fabric. So, Christ's object, in coming into the world, is to purge out the dross of sin from the hearts of the children of men, and to cleanse them from the polluting stains of iniquity. 'Behold the Lamb of God, which *taketh away* the *sin* of *the world.*'

'Here endeth the first lesson' of instruction from the Holy Bible. Turn we then to the 'new covenant,' in order to prove to thee, reader, that *Universal holiness* and *happiness* are likewise there to be traced in rays of light, words of truth, and letters of Love.

UNIVERSALISM A NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE.

76. 'And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save *his people* from their sins.' Matthew i. 21. This text in connexion with others which declare that *all* things have been delivered into the hands of Christ, will show the object of his mission to be, to *save sinners*, in general.

77. 'They shall call his name Emanuel, which being interpreted, is *God with us.*' 23.

78. 'Think not I am come to destroy the *law* or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil; for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.' Mat. v. 17, 18. The sum of this law is *love* to God and love to man. How then can this law be fulfilled in every iota, unless universal Love shall prevail in the empire of the Eternal? If endless sinning and wretchedness exist, the law of love must necessarily fail of fulfilment, eternally!

79. 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, *resist not evil.*' 38, 39. Would Christ recommend a different course of conduct to be pursued by his disciples from that which Deity pursues towards his creatures?' And would not the infliction of endless pain be acting on the principle repudiated by our Lord?

80. 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your *enemies*, bless them that curse you,' &c, 43, 44. And will God do less? All are enemies to God by wicked works, and we may rest assured, that our Heavenly Father will not teach us, by his Son, to do that which *he* never intends to do.

81. 'That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and the unjust.' 45. This settles the point as to the dealings of Providence with those who are his enemies. By loving our enemies, we become, characteristically, the children of the Most High. His impartiality to the just and unjust is the foundation of the injunction to us, to love our enemies.

82. 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.' 48. It is then human and Divine perfection to love our enemies, to bless those who curse, &c. And who willl dare to raise the impious thought that God will not remain altogether a *perfect* Being forever! As immutable, therefore, as are the attributes of Deity, so sure is it that the *perfection* of his nature will cause him to *love all his enemies*, and blot out their transgressions from the book of his remembrance. Here then is a Rock of Eternal Truth, and the "gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Were there not another word, in the sacred oracles, in favor of universal salvation, this plain and simple argument, from the teachings of Christ, ought to silence forever the cavils of the sceptical professor, and the doubts of the fearful and unbelieving.

83. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged; for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.' Math. vii. 1. 2. *Endless misery cannot be measured*; therefore, are those fortunate who are in the habit of judging their fellow men to irremediable torments!

84. 'Or what man is there of you, whom, if his son ask

bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, *being evil*, know how to give good gifts to your children, *how much more* shall your Father, which is in heaven, give good things to them that ask him?' Not a word of comment is necessary, to exhibit the interesting light in which this passage sets forth the superior affection of God to that of earthly parents. The conclusion is this; If *evil* earthly parents *would* confer eternal joys upon their children, 'how much more' will the infinitely *good* Parent of all, bestow imperishable blessings upon his creatures.

85. '*All* things are delivered unto me of my Father.' Mat. xi. 27. Luke x. 22.

86. 'The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took and sowed in his field; which indeed is the least of all seeds, but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.' Mat. iii, 31, 32.

87. 'The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the *whole* was leavened.' 33. These two passages represent the rapid growth and transforming nature of the gospel of Christ. *It* has power to assimilate, to its own character, the mass into which it is placed, and will not cease its wondrous working, until *the whole* is brought under its enlightening and enlivening influence!

88 'For the son of man is come to *save* that which is *lost*.' Mat. xviii 11.

89. 'But Jesus said, suffer *little children*, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven. xix. 14. This proves that our Lord did not consider children to be heirs of eternal perdition, unless they had faith and repentance, as the creeds of the day virtually teach.

90. The recompense meted out to the laborers in the master's vineyard proves the equality of divine goodness. 'They received, every man a penny,' Mat. xx. 9, 10, those who

came in at the eleventh hour, and those who bore the burden and heat of the day. The selfrighteousness of any will not prevent their supposed wicked neighbors from enjoying alike of the bounties of the Giver of every good.

91. 'Even as the son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and to give his a ransom for many.' 28.

92. 'In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the *angels of God in heaven.*' xxii. 30. 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' 32.

93 'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.' xxviii. 18.

94. 'For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels which are in heaven.' Mark xii, 25.

95. 'For David himself said by the holy Ghost,the Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.' 36. Does not this prove that Christ will finally come off more than conqueror over the world, the flesh, and the devil, and place all things under his feet?

96. 'Fear not, behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to *all* people.' Luke ii, 10.

97. 'Glory to God in the highest, on earth, peace, goodwill to men.' 14.

98. 'For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of *all* people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel 30, 32.'

99. And *all flesh* shall see the salvation of God.' iii, 6.

100. 'The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath annointed me to preach the gospel to the poor, he hath sent me to heal the broken hearted.' &c. iv. 18. This shows the benevolent nature of the embassy of Jesus. And he fulfilled his mission in such a manner, that 'all bare him witness and wondered at the *graeious* words which proceeded out of his mouth.' 22. The prophecy and its fulfilment prove conclusively that our Lord did not discourse of 'endless flames' and 'fiery chains,' but of salvation, of peace and mercy.

101. 'Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father in heaven

is merciful.' vi, 36.- This injunction is reasonable. We should imitate the God we worship and assimilate our characters to his, but not surpass him in merciful disposition—as we would do, on the supposition that an unmerciful punishment will be inflicted by him. Such an infliction *we* could not authorize.

102. 'And, when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both.' vii, 42. In this parable Christ sets forth the utter insolvency of the human family, and the like forgiveness of those who are indebted to God a large and a small amount. All being sinners and unable to pay their debts, all require forgiveness, and are dependent on the *grace* or favor of God, not their own works, for their release and pardon.

103. 'Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings? and not one of them is forgotten before God' * * * fear not therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows.' xii, 6, 7.

104. 'Consider the ravens, for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them. How much more are ye better than the fowls?' 24.

105. 'Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' xv, 10. This was the application 'Christ made of the parables of the lost sheep,' and the 'lost piece of silver.' The shepherd leaveth the ninety and nine and went after his lost sheep. The woman lighted a candle and searched diligently for the lost piece of silver, and they both rejoiced, with their friends, on the occasion of their success. So likewise, will there be more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons, who need no repentance. Now, we would ask, if the joy of the heavenly host is increased by the repentance of *one* sinner, can there be "fulness of joy" in the celestial courts, until all sinners repent and turn to God? Or, if any are *finally impenitent*,' in the language of the pulpit, 'not of the Bible,' will not the joy of angels be thereby diminished, or something wanting to make their bliss complete?

106. The parable of the "prodigal son," is an interesting

exposition of the doctrine of God's continued paternal care and compassion to his wayward children. When the returning prodigal "was yet a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion, ran and fell upon his neck and kissed him,"—He also put on him the best robe and a ring upon his finger, and rejoiced and made merry with his friends, saying, "for this *my son* was dead and is alive again, he was lost and is found." Luke xv. 11–24. Now it will be observed that this son was a prodigal—yet he was still *the son* and the object of his father's love. Though abandoned and degraded, he lost not his relationship to his compassionate parents. And so of the sinner; though "*dead* in trespasses and in sins," and emphatically "lost," God's parental loving-kindness will never fail him, in his extremity.

107. "For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which *was lost.*' Luke xix. 10. The inference from this is, the greater the sinner the more need of a Saviour—and as Christ came to save sinners, even the chief, he will accomplish his work and recover all who have been 'lost.'

108. 'But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage. Neither can they *die* any more; for they are *equal* unto the *angels;* and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.' Luke xx. 35, 36. It will be conceded by all Christians that the resurrection of the whole human family is a doctrine of the Bible. All shall be "accounted worthy," or, as it might be rendered, they who are honored to obtain that world, &c. shall die no more. If, therefore, death is to have no power over the spiritual nature of man, and all are to become "equal to the angels" which minister around the throne of God, to what other conclusion can we arrive, than that of universal purity and blessedness? Let it be borne in mind that the passage just quoted is the language of Christ, and was spoken in relation to a general resurrection, not that of any particular class of people. It is therefore a convincing proof of the doctrine in question.

109. "Then said Jesus, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." Luke xxiii. 34. This prayer of the blessed Saviour for his persecutors and his murderers will or will not be answered. If it will *not*, then has Christ prayed in vain and supplicated his Father for nought. If it will be heard and answered in behalf of the worst of men, what will hinder the success of Christ's intercession for the whole human race?

110. 'Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world.' John i. 29.

111. 'For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world, through him, might be saved.' John iii. 17.

112. 'The Father loveth the Son and hath given *all* things into his hands.' 35.

113. 'For the Father judgeth no man but hath committed all judgment to the Son.' v. 22.

114. 'All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.' vi 37.

115. 'For I came down from heaven, not to do my own will but the will of him that sent me.' 38.

116. 'And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.' 39.

117. 'No man *can* come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day.' 44.

118. 'And they shall be all taught of God.' 45.

119. '*Now is* the *judgment* of this world, *now* shall the prince of this world be cast out.' xii. 31.

120. 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw *all men* unto me.' 32.

121. 'Glorify thy Son, that thy Son may also glorify thee; as thou hast given him power over *all flesh*, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.' xvii. 1, 2.

122 'For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to *all* that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God

shall call.' Acts ii. 39. The call of God being universal, all are included in this promise. 'Ho every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters.' &c.

123. 'And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive, until the times of RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy Prophets since the world began.' Acts iii 21.

124. 'Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the *kindreds* of the earth be blessed.' 25.

125. 'God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.' 26.

126. 'God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.' Acts x. 28. The vision which Peter saw, 'as it had been a great sheet, let down from heaven, by four corners,' in which were four footed beasts and creeping things, &c. and the rebuke the apostle received, when commanded to slay and eat,' proved to him that 'God was no respecter of persons.' It is also a word of reproof to those who think that some men are *so* 'common and unclean' as never to be capable of purification and sanctification! The drawing up the sheet with all its contents of 'creeping things,' &c. *into heaven* is figurative of God's purpose in relation to the human family.

127. 'And we declare unto you, *glad tidings*, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fufilled the same unto us their children.' xiii. 32, 33.

128. 'Neverthless he left not himself without witness, in that *he did good*, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.' xiv. 17.

129. 'And hath made of *one blood all* nations of men for to dwell upon all the face of the earth.' xvii. 26.

130. 'For in him we live, and move, and have our being, as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring.' 28. The apostle here quotes from the

heathen poets in support of the universal sentiment, that God is the Father of men; and if *all* live and move and have their being in Jehovah, how can any ever have an existence in the "Prince of darkness"?

131. 'For I have not shunned to declare unto you *all* the counsel of God.' xx, 27. If this declaration of the apostle be true, the doctrine of *endless misery* cannot be any part of the Gospel of Christ, because such a dogma was never preached by the Apostle Paul. He never declared *hell* or *endless damnation* once, in all his writings! How then can that be any part of the counsel of God, which was never lisped by so great an ambassador of salvation!

132. 'And have *hope* toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, *both* of the *just* and *unjust*.' xxiv. 14. Unless we can admit the idea that the apostle could *hope* for so awful an event as endless woe, for a part of the human race, this text proves universal salvation. He *hoped* for the resurrection of the *unjust*, and could not, therefore, have *believed* that such resurrection would only be the prelude to unending pain and wretchedness! In the context, moreover, he tells us that he 'believed all things which are written in the Law and the Prophets.' Now it is conceeded on all hands, that the sentiment of endless woe is not to be found in the *Old* Testament, in which the law and the Prophets are recorded.

133. 'But God *commendeth* his *Love* towards us, in that while we were yet *sinners*, Christ died for us.' Romans v. 8.

134. 'Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment come upon *all men* to condemnation; even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life.' 18.

135. 'For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' 19.

136. 'Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace

reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ, our Lord.' 20, 21.

137. 'For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature (creation) shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' viii 20. 21.

138. 'For I am persuaded, that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the Love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.' 38, 39.

139. 'For I would not, brethren that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits, that blindness in part is happened unto Israel, *until the fulness* of the *Gentiles* be come in. And so *all* Israel shall be saved.' xi. 25. 26.

140. 'For God hath concluded then *all* in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon *all*.' xi. 32.

141. 'For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him and to him are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen.' 34—36. This passage proves that all we are and have are the gifts of God's *free grace*, and that it is impossible for us to place the Almighty in our debt, by the best works we can perform. Hence none can lay claim to *exclusive* privileges, on the score of their merits.

142. 'Recompense to no man evil for evil.' xii. 17. If this is a christian precept, will Deity act differently and render infinite evil in lieu of finite transgression? By no means.

143. 'Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good.' xii. 20, 21. Every one will admit that this is a most noble and praise-worthy sentiment. 'To err is human—to forgive *divine*.' Why then should it be supposed

that Jehovah will not 'overcome evil with good' as he has enjoined upon us by his apostle. 'Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall man be more pure than his maker?' God forbid.

144. '*Love* worketh *no ill* to his neighbor, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.' xiii. 10. Will then Almighty Love work out an infinite ill to the children of his hand, as the fulfilment of the law of love? Impossible.

145. 'For whether we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord; whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's; for to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord, both of the dead and living.' xiv. 8, 9.

146. 'As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me and every tongue shall confess to God.' 11.

147. 'If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.' 1 Cor. iii. 15.

148. 'Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall *every man* have *praise* of God.' iv. 5.

149. 'To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' v. 5. Here we find that the object of punishment is the mortification, or subjection of the flesh, and the *salvation* of the spirit.

150. 'Charity suffereth long and is kind;' * * * 'thinketh no evil;' * * * * 'never faileth;' * * 'And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is *charity*.' xiii. 4, 5, 8, 13. Love or charity being the essence of Deity and such being the nature of the principle,—nothing but the greatest blessings can possibly flow from so pure a source.

151. 'And now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first fruits* of them that slept.' 1 Cor. xv. 20. The figure here used is taken from the custom among the Jews of sanc-

tifying the harvest by offering the "first fruits" in sacrifice. *As* were the 'first fruits' *so* were the after-fruits—the former being a pledge or antepast of the latter; we are moreover certified that 'if the first-fruits be holy, the lump is also holy.' Now, if Christ is the 'first fruits' of them who slept, and he is holy and pure, so must be the great harvest of the dead, in the resurrection state.

152. 'For as in Adam *all* die, even so in Christ shall *all* be made alive.' 1 Cor. xv. 22. Here we have a plain, positive and unequivocal declaration of the universal benefits flowing from the resurrection of Christ. *All* mankind die in Adam or in their earthly nature—and just so many as thus die (even *all*) will be made alive in Christ, which must mean a life of blessedness, for "they who are in Christ are new creatures."

153. 'Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power, for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' 24, 25.

154. 'The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' 26. If death is the last enemy of man, and this enemy is to be destroyed, mankind may rejoice in the assurance of endless felicity near the throne of the Eternal. There cannot, by any possibility, be the least danger of falling, after death, into the hands of an infinitely malignant demon!

155. 'And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself, be subject unto him that put all things under him, that *God may be all in all.*' 28. This text and that quoted the last but one, will prove the entire subjugation of all things to Christ, before he delivers up his mediatorial Kingdom to his Father. It will also show the object of this universal subjection, or the final result thereof, 'that *God may be all in all.*' And how different is this consummation of all things from that supposed by many to take place when the "end cometh"! And how strange, that it should be thought, that an awful day of judgment is to succeed that period, when Christ, to whom all judgment was committed, has actually *finished* the work of *judging* men.

and accomplished their entire subjection to his sway!

156. 'So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power: It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.' 42, 44.

157. 'And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.' 49.

158. 'Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.' 51.

159. 'And the dead shall be raised incorruptible and we shall be changed.' 52.

160. 'For this mortal must put on immortality.' 53.

161. 'So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory.' 55. There are two or three points of importance established by the foregoing. 1st That there *is a change* and a very great change to befal mankind *after death*, 2d. that the dead in general are to be raised incorruptible, and 3d. that this incorruptibility and immortality is a spiritual existence which is entirely free from the pains, sicknesses and sufferings of a mortal and corruptible life—the words in the original language translated immortal, incorruptible, &c. being of strictly endless signification and never found in connexion with any thing of a temporal nature.

162. 'Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the father of mercies, and the God of all comfort; who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in trouble, by the comfort, wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.' 2d. Cor. i, 3, 4.

163. 'Sufficient to such a man is this punishment which was inflicted of many, so that contrary-wise, ye ought rather to forgive him and comfort him, lest perhaps, such a one should be swallowed up, with overmuch sorrow.' &c. 2 Cor. ii, 6, 7. This text shows the object of punishment to be remedial in its nature.

164. 'Now the Lord is that spirit: and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.' iii, 17. God is *Love*, and

where infinite Love is, there is freedom from all wrath, hatred and uncharitableness.

165. 'For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' v. 1.

166. 'For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.' 14.

167. 'Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature.' 17.

168. 'God was in Christ reconciling *the world* unto himself.' 19.

169. 'And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen, through faith, preached before the *Gospel* unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed.' Galatians iii. 8.

170. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law. 13.

171. 'And this, I say, that the convenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ. the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.' 17.

172. 'Is the law then against the promises? God forbid.' 21.

173. 'He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption.' vi. 8. This is evidence that no one can reap an endless harvest of retribution, from the sowing to the flesh in this life. The product must be like to the seed sown, and not entirely of a different nature.

174. 'Having made known unto us the mystery of his *will* according to his *good pleasure*, which he hath *purposed* in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together IN ONE *all things*, in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him.' Ephesians i, 9, 10.

175 'And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church.' 22.

176. 'But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ.' ii, 4, 5.

177. 'For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.' iii, 14, 15.

178. 'And be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God, for Christ's sake *hath forgiven* you.' iv, 32.

179. 'Wherefore God hath also highly exhalted him, and given a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus, *every knee* should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that *every tongue* should *confess* that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Phillippians, ii 9 10 11.

180. 'For it pleased the Father, that in him should *all fulness* dwell, and having made peace, through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile all* things unto himself; by him, I say, whether, they be things in earth, or things in heaven.' Colossians i, 19, 20.

181. 'For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' ii, 9.

182. 'For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.' 1st. Thessalonians, v. 9, 10.

183. 'This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief.' 1st Timothy, 1, 15.

184. 'Who will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth.' ii, 4.

185. 'Who gave himself a ransom for *all*, to be testified in due time.' 6.

186. 'I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.' 8. To pray *in faith* and to pray *for all* is the sum of the apostle's injunction, which implies that all are objects of the Almighty's care, or else there is an inconsistency in the requisition. A partialist *dare* not pray according to his creed, or *in faith*; yet he *cannot* pray for all, believing that all will be blessed. He is thus in a dilemma, from which nothing can extricate

him, but by enlarging his creed, so as to correspond with his supplications, at the throne of grace! Indeed, we want no better evidence of the fallacy of the dogma of endless wrath, than the fact, that it can not be *prayed for* by any living creature; while, on the contrary, the truth of universal salvation is clearly demonstrated by the command to pray for *all*, and to pray *in faith*.

187. 'For therefore, we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the Living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those who believe.' iv, 10.

188. 'Who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.' 2d Tim. i, 10.

189. 'For the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared,' (marginal and correct reading.) Titus, ii, 11.

190. 'Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity.' 14.

191. 'But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man.' Hebrews, ii, 9.

192. 'That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' 14 15.

193. 'For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, surely blessing I will bless thee.' vi, 13, 14.

194. 'Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath. 17.

195. 'He is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established on better promises.' viii, 6.

196. 'For all shall know me, from the least unto the greatest, for I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.' 11, 12.

197. 'Now faith is the substance (foundation) of things hoped for, and the evidence (assurance) of things not seen.'

xi, 1. If this definition be correct, endless perdition is not true, for no Christian ever *hoped* for that doom to fall upon any of his fellow creatures.

198. The object of God's chastisements as set forth in the twelth chapter of Hebrews, 4th to 11th verses, proves their limited nature: 'For our profit, (saith the apostle,) that we may *afterwards* bring forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness.' Such language could never have been used in reference to *endless* chastisement, as the opportunity, in that case, for reformation, would never be given.

199. 'Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.' James i, 14 15. This passage shows the origin of sin to be in the *lust* of the flesh, which all will admit perishes with the body; if the cause is thus removed, will the effect be perpetuated throughout eternity? Or can an unlimited effect proceed from a finite and limited cause?

200. 'But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.' iii, 17.

201. 'And if any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole world*.' 1 John ii, 2.

202. 'For this purpose, the son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.' ii, 8.

203. 'For GOD IS LOVE.' iv, 8 and 16.

204. 'In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him.' 9.

205. 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his son to be the propitiation for our sins.' 10.

206. 'And we have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the son to be the *Saviour of the World*.' 14.

207. 'There is no fear in Love: but perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love.' 18.

208. 'We love him because he *first loved* us.' 10. If our love is the effect of God's prior love to us, is it not plain that the cause must continue to exist, if mankind are expected to love their Creator supremely? The command is, "Love the Lord thy God," and this command is of perpetual obligation. It is moreover a truth that God's law must be satisfied in 'every iota,' or, in other words, Universal Love must prevail throughout all time and space, as the consequence of the eternity of God's benevolence.

209. 'He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; becuse he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" v. 10, 11.

210. 'Beloved, * * * * I gave all diligence to write unto you of the *common salvation.*' Jude 3.

211. 'Thou art worthy, O, Lord, to receive glory, and honor, and power; for thou hast created all things, and *for thy pleasure, they are and were created.*' Rev. iv, 11.

212. 'And *every creature* which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb, forever and ever. Rev. v. 13.

213. 'And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to *every nation*, and *kindred* and *tongue* and *people.*' xiv.6.

214. "Who shall not fear thee, Oh Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy, for *all nations* shall come and worship before thee', xv. 4.

215. "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth, * * * and I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes! and *there shall be no* more *death*, neither *sorrow*, nor *crying*, neither shall there be any more *pain*, for the former things are passed away. xxi, 1—4.

CHAPTER III.

Objections to the doctrine of Universal Salvation, from Scripture, carefully examined in brief comments on those passages which are usually brought forward in support of the dogma of *endless misery*.

A little reflection will serve to show every intelligent person, that the idea of a place or state of endless wretchedness for man in a future world, is based upon the popular interpretation of a very few words in the Sacred Volume. These words are HELL, DAMNATION, EVERLASTING, PERISH, DESTRUCTION, FIRE, &c. as connected with the retributions of sin. For the sake of brevity, therefore, and to avoid unnecessary repetition in the present chapter, we shall first give an exposition of the scriptural meaning of these terms, which exposition we design as a *Key* to the true purport of various passages, in which they are found, throughout the Bible. With this Key, the reader will be enabled to unlock the "hidden mysteries" which he has been taught to believe are contained in many portions of the Divine Record, and to enter within the door of the temple of Truth, so long closed against the mass of the people, by the craftiness of an interested Priesthood. He will also have it in his power to discover how much the character of the Most High has been dishonored, and the highest hopes of the human heart have been crushed and blighted, by the false coloring put upon certain words and phrases, of the plainest import, when not viewed through the *smoked glass* of a dark and heathenish Theology.

SECTION I.—*HELL.*

There are *four* words, in the original languages of the Bible, which are translated by the term *hell.* These words are SHEOL, HADES, GEHENNA, and TARTAROS, having a different origin and signification, but which have been translated as if they were synonymous in meaning, and all expressive of the single idea of a *place of torment* in eternity! It is a remarkable fact, however, that instead of so many words being found to signify one and the same notion, not one of the four words, in their primary import and meaning, have any

reference to the matter to which they are usually applied, as will more fully appear hereafter.

Of SHEOL, the Hebrew word, and the one translated *Hell*, in the Old Testament, the following definition is given by Dr. George Campbell, an enlightened and approved Commentator of the Scotch Presbyterian Church:—"*Sheol* signifies the state of the dead, in general, without regard to the *goodness* or *badness* of the persons, their *happiness* or *misery*." He also says, that "this state is always represented under those figures which suggest something dreadful, dark, and silent, about which the most prying eye and listening ear can acquire no information," and that the most ancient Jews "observed the *most profound silence* upon the *state* of the deceased, as to their *happiness* or *misery*. They spoke of it simply as a place of silence, darkness and inactivity."

Dr. John Jahn, of the Catholic Church, whose valuable work has been translated under the sanction of Professor Stuart, of the Andover Presbyterian Theological Seminary, remarks as follows: "The belief of the ancient Hebrews, on this subject, was that the spirits of the dead were received into Sheol, (or hell,) which is represented as a large subterranean abode, into which the wicked *were driven suddenly*, their days being cut short, but that the good descended into it in *tranquility* and *in the fulness of their years*. This very spacious dwelling place for those who have gone hence, is often described, as dark sorrowful and inactive." Again the same author says: "That the ancient Jews believed there was a difference in their situation, in Sheol, between the good and the bad, *cannot be proved* by any direct testimony." The same or similar views have been given to this word, by the learned of every religious faith, and it is now a settled point that it signifies *literally*, the GRAVE, OF STATE OF THE DEAD, and *figuratively*, gloom, trouble and distress. And no Greek or Hebrew scholar, who sets any value upon his classical reputation, will venture to affirm that any other than this is the true and proper meaning of the word.

Sheol occurs *sixty-four* times in the Bible, and is rendered

*grave** in twenty-nine places, thrice *pit*,† and about thirty-two times *hell*,‡ a variation which proves, that in the judgment of the translators, with whom the word *hell* was a favorite term, and the idea connected with it a cherished doctrine, there was an essential difference in the meaning of the word. Hence, as Dr. Campbell remarks, they "were *constrained* sometimes to depart from the term *hell*, because it was too glaring a perversion of the original." We contend, however, that the word does not admit of this radical change in its signification. Either *hell* is the proper translation of Sheol, or it is not. If it is, then it should so have been rendered, in all those passages where the words *grave* and *pit* have been substituted, *per necessitatem*, or through the force of circumstances. For instance, when Jacob rent his clothes and mourned for his son Joseph, saying, "I will go down into the *grave* unto my son mourning;" it should read, "I will go down into *hell* unto my son mourning." Gen. xxxvii. 35. And again, when he said "ye will bring my grey hairs with sorrow to the *grave*," Gen. xlii. 38. he meant that his grey hairs would be brought to *hell!* Likewise, we would be told that Korah and his company "went down alive into *hell*, and the *earth* closed upon them," Numbers xvi. 33, and the Psalmist would be made to say, that his "bones were scattered at *hell's* mouth," Ps. cxli. 7, and that his "life draweth nigh unto *hell*." Ps. lxxxviii. 3. The patient Job, moreover, would be represented as calling upon God to "hide him in *hell*," Job xiv. 13; and Solomon as saying "there is no

* Translated *grave* in Genesis xxxvii. 35; xlii. 38; xliv. 29, 31; 1 Sam ii. 6; 1 Kings ii. 6, 9; Job vii. 9; xiv. 13; xvii. 13; xxi. 13; xxiv. 19; Ps. vi. 5; xxx. 3; xxxi. 17; xlix. 14, 15; lxxxviii. 3; lxxxix. 48; cxli. 7; Prov. i. 12; xxx. 16; Eccl. ix. 10; Cant. viii. 6; Isaiah xxxviii. 10, 18; Ezekiel xxxi. 15; Hosea xiii. 14.

† Rendered *Pit* in Numbers xvi. 30, 33; and Job xvii. 16.

‡ Translated *Hell* in Deut. xxxii. 22; 2 Sam. xxii. 6; Job xi. 8; xxvi. 6, Ps. ix. 17; xvi. 10; xviii. 5; lv. 15; lxxxvi. 13; cxvi. 3; cxxxix. 8; Prov. v. 5; vii. 27; ix. 18; xv. 11, 24; xxiii. 14; xxvii. 20; Isaiah v. 14; xiv. 9, 15; lvii. 9; Ezekiel xxxi. 16, 17; xxxii. 21, 27; Amos ix. 2; Jonah ii. 2; and Hab. ii. 5.

work, &c. in *hell* whither thou goest" !! Eccl. ix. 10. According to this, too, *hell* itself is to be destroyed, for Hosea would be made to say, "Oh *hell* I will be thy destruction;" a *truth*, by the way which the translators were cunning enough to keep to themselves.

To prove further that the word hell is an inappropriate translation of Sheol, and that it has often a *limited* meaning when thus used, the reader will please refer to the various passages where it occurs in the Old Testament. Of Christ it was spoken, prophetically, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hell*, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." Here every one can see that the word *grave* would have been a better rendering, for no one will pretend that the Saviour of the world was ever in an endless *hell*. David says likewise, "The sorrows of *hell* compassed me about;" —"the pains of *hell* gat hold upon me," and, "thou hast delivered me out of the lowest *hell*," all of which must be understood figuratively, to represent temporal distress and trouble, as David lived to record these matters for our information. Jonah declared also, when in the belly of the fish, that "out of the belly of *hell*" he cried, and the Lord heard his voice and rescued him, proving that in this place *sheol* has the figurative meaning ascribed to it by Dr. Campbell and others, viz: a dark and hidden place. We arrive then at the following facts, concerning the word rendered *hell* in the Old Testament.

1. That it is a word primarily used to signify only the *grave*, or *state of the dead*.
2. That the *moral character* of those who departed thither did not affect their situation in Sheol, for *all* went into the same state.
3. That the word cannot be translated uniformly by the term *Hell*, in the modern acceptation of that term, for that would make the patriarch Jacob expect to go into a place of torment, and prove that the Saviour of the world, David, Jonah, &c. were once sufferers in the gloomy prison house of *the damned!*

4. That in every instance, in the Old Testament, the word *grave* might be substituted for the term *hell*, either in the literal or figurative sense of the former, (for said word has a figurative meaning in the scriptures,) without any violence to the record.
5. That, even if Sheol did mean a place of misery, we have the "sure word of prophecy," that it shall eventually be *destroyed*. Hosea xiii. 14.
6. We have the evidence of the learned, who believe in endless woe, that no reliance can be placed upon the term *Sheol* to prove that dogma. This point is universally conceded.

Of HADES, *a Greek word, translated Hell in the New Testament.* What has already been advanced concerning *Sheol*, in the Hebrew, will apply with equal force to *Hades*, in the Greek, as the latter word is the counterpart of the former and corresponds precisely thereto in signification. The word is derived from *alpha*, not, and *eido*, to see—*not seen*, or *hidden, invisible, obscure*, and "ought never to be rendered *hell*," in the opinion of Dr. Campbell. Mr. Wesley says that "*Hades* does *not* mean the *place of the damned*; it is literally the invisible world, the state of separate spirits, whether good or bad." And Dr. Whitbey believes that it means simply *the grave*. This word occurs *eleven* times in the New Testament, in no instance of which, save that of Luke xvi. 23, is the word supposed by any one to teach the idea of endless misery. Once it is translated *grave*, in 1 Corinthians xv. 55; twice it is used in reference to Christ's resurrection from the tomb, Acts ii. 27, 31; twice in a figurative sense to express the "*desolation*" coming upon Capernaum, according to Dr. Adam Clarke, of the Methodist Church, Math. xi. 23, Luke x. 15; once in reference to the stability of the church, despite of the powers of darkness, Math. xvi 18; and twice in Revelations i. 18, vi. 8, in connexion with *death*, and once in the 20th chapter, 13th and 14th verses of the same, in proof of itself and death being destroyed in the "lake of fire"!!

GEHENNA, the third word in the original Scriptures, translated *hell*, is a compound of two Hebrew words, *Ghi* and *Hinnom*, and means the *Valley* of *Hinnom*, near Jerusalem. It is found *twelve* times in the Greek of the New Testament, and uniformly rendered *hell*. In the Bible *Ghi-Hinnom* is always rendered "Valley of Hinnom," or "Valley of the son of Hinnom," because it was the property of a family of the name of Hinnom. In Joshua xv. 8, this valley is described as the boundary of the portion or lot of the children of Judah. The geographical position of this *hell* is thus pointed out by the pen of inspiration, and who will dare to remove the ancient land-marks? In 2 Chronicles xxxiii. 6, some account is given of what the evil king Manasseh did in this "Valley of Hinnom," "Ghi-Hinnom," "Gehenna," or "Hell." "He caused his children to pass through the fire, in the valley of the Son of Hinnom." In 2 Kings xxiii. 10. we are informed that the good king Josiah "defiled Tophet, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Moloch." The prophet Jeremiah vii. 31–32, describes the idolatry of the Israelites in this valley. "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the Son of Hinnom. to *burn* their sons and their daughters *in the fire*, which I commanded them not." He also predicts the issue of this wickedness,—"Therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the Son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter, for they shall bury in Tophet, till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the beasts of the forest, and none shall fray them away."

The opinions of the most eminent critics on the word *Gehenna* coincide precisely with what has thus been advanced. In Dr. Bailey's English Dictionary, Gehenna is defined to be "a place in the valley of the tribe of Benjamin, terrible for two sorts of fire in it, that wherein the Israelites sacrificed their children to the idol Moloch, and also another kept continually burning to consume the dead carcasses and filth of

Jerusalem." Dr. Parkhurst says, that the phrase Gehenna, of fire, or "hell fire," "in its *outward* and *primary* sense, relates to that dreadful doom of being burnt alive in the valley of Hinnom." So also Dr. Adam Clarke, Dr. Hammond, Lightfoot, Grotius and the mass of commentators of the endless punishment school. Notwithstanding they all believed in an endless hell, and relied upon the supposed figurative meaning of this very word to prove the doctrine, yet they were compelled to acknowledge, that in its primary and outward import, it had no other signification than the *valley of Hinnom.* And that it ever became an *emblem* of *torment* in a *future world* is a mere conjecture, without a particle of proof to sustain the position.

On examination of the twelve places in the New Testament where the word *hell*, as the translation of *Gehenna*, occurs, we will find that several of them are parallel passages, thus: Math, v, 29, 30, xviii, 9, and Mark ix, 43, 45, 47, are parallel. So are Math. x. 28, and Luke xii. 5. These are in fact then but two instances of the use of the word. Add to these Math. v. 22, xxiii. 15, 33; and James iii. 6, and we have the whole story. Our Saviour actually used the word on but three or four occasions, and James only once! No other disciple ever used the word! It occurs only in Mathew, Mark, Luke and James! Is not found in the Gospel of John, the book of the Acts, nor in any other epistle in the New Testament! Was used by Christ in two cases only to the Jews—in all the rest he was addressing his own disciples. It was never threatened against the Gentiles. In fine, the Jews understood the word as did their own prophets, and when Christ threatened them with punishment in *Gehenna*, he must of course be supposed to have used it in the same sense, unless the contrary is made to appear. Reader, these are the *facts* in relation to a word, on which the chief reliance is now placed to prove an endless hell. Alas! for dame "Orthodoxy," so called, if such is her sole dependance in support of the *precious* dogma of ceaseless burnings! Her days are numbered. The last prop of her declining years

is bending under the weight af her palsied frame: MENE, MENE, TEKEL, is the *fiat* which has gone forth against her, and her doom is sealed. So mote it be.

TARTARUS is the last word rendered *hell* in the Bible, and this occurs but once. 2 Peter ii. 4. It is a word of acknowledged heathen origin, and is not relied on by any in proof of endless suffering. The Tartarean shades were a kind of Pagan Purgatory, through which the wicked were to pass before they could reach Elysium, through the gates of ivory.

Of the English word HELL. This term is derived from an Anglo-Saxon word *Helan*, to cover or hide, in old English, *to hele, to heal*, or *to hil.* According to J. Horne Tooke, hell, heel, hill, hale, whole, hall, hull, hole, halt and hold are all derived from the same *radix* or root, as will appear from the following illustration:

"HELL, any place, or some place *covered over.* HEEL, that part of the foot which is *covered* by the leg. HILL, any heap of earth, or stone &c by which the plain or level surface of the earth is *covered.* HALE, i. e. HEALED or WHOLE. WHOLE, the same as HALE, i. e. *covered.* It was formerly written HOLE, without the W. As a wound or sore is HEALED or Whole, that is, *covered* over by the skin. Which manner of expression will not seem extraordinary, if we consider our use of the word *recover.* HALL, a *covered* building, where persons assemble, or where goods are protected from the weather. HULL, of a nut, &c. That by which the nut is *covered.* HOLE, some place *covered* over. "You shall seek for holes to hide your heads in." HOLT. *Holed hol'd holt.* A rising ground or knole *covered* with trees. HOLD, as the hold of a ship: in which things are *covered:* or the *covered* part of a ship."

In proof of which, Mr. Tooke quotes a few extracts from the New Testament in its first translation into English, from which it is seen that HILID, HILED, HILIDEN, HILLIS, HILE, HELLA, HELLIS, and HYLL were the phrases then used to re-

present the idea now conveyed by the terms *covered, hid, concealed, &c.*

Ray says, "In the West, he that covers a house with slates is called a HEALER, or HELLIER. Dr. A. Clarke says, "As the word HELL comes from the Anglo-Saxon HELAN, to cover or hide, hence the *tyling* or *slating* of a house is called, in some parts of England, (particularly Cornwall,) *heling* to this day; and the *covers* of books, in Lancashire, by the the same name. So the literal import of the original word Hades was formerly well expressed by it." And this testimony was confirmed to the writer by a very intelligent Englishman, from Cornwall, England, whom he saw last summer at the Columbia county gold mines. The words *helling, hell* and *hellier* are yet in use, he says, in Cornwall, in the sense spoken of by Dr. Clarke. These proofs must satisfy the most sceptical that neither the Hebrew, Greek, Latin or English word, in its primary import, gives any support whatever to the popular Theology of this age, connected with the final destiny of man. "Whoso readeth let him understand."

SECTION II.—*DAMNATION.*

This word is a translation of two Greek words *Krima* and *Krisis*, and occurs nine times in the New Testament. On examination of the passages, we find that it has in several instances a reference to punishment or condemnation which was to be endured in this life; for example: the apostle Paul in Romans xiii. 3, says that those who resist the civil authority "shall receive to themselves damnation." Again in 1 Cor. xi, 29, the unworthy communicant is said to eat and drink damnation to himself, and this is explained in the next verse—"for this cause many are weak and sickly among you." In 1 Tim. v. 12, Paul speaks of the younger widows "having damnation, because they had cast off their first faith." This in the present tense. So also in Romans, iii 8, the apostle speaks of some living slanderers "whose damnation IS just." The word in Mat. xxiii, 33, is in connection with Gehenna; in the Latin Testament, *judicio Gehennæ*, the judgment of the valley of Hinnom. The word in Mat xxiii 14, is *Krima*, and in the 33d verse *Kriseos*, both

translated damnation. In 2 Peter ii 3, the word damnation is a translation from the Greek word usually rendered perdition or destruction,—*apoleia*. The two remaining instances of the occurrence of the word will receive special notice in their proper order.

The word *damned* occurs thrice in the New Testament, Mark xvi 16: 2 Thes. ii. 12, and Romans xiv, 23, in the latter place manifestly of limited application. "He that doubteth *is damned* if he eat." Of the other passages we shall speak hereafter.

The Greek words Krima and Krisis are used synonimously in our common translation, and are rendered Judgment, condemnation, &c. &c. The words condemn, condemned and condemnation are synonimous with damn, damned and damnation, being derived from the same primary word. One instance is found in John iii, 18-19. "He that believeth not is condemned already"—is damned already. "This is the condemnation that light has come into the world," &c.—this is the damnation. From which it will appear that damnation could be experienced in this state of existence.

Again, to show what little reliance can be placed upon the original words, in proof of endless misery, let us see how several passages would read, had they been translated uniformly by the term damnation. Christ said, John ix 39, "for *judgment* I am come into the world." Here the same word is found which is rendered damnation in Math. xxiii, 14. And if the latter word (with its present idea) be a correct translation, we prove that the coming of Christ was for the purpose of damning the world forever! In Peter iv, 17, we read "the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God," that is, damnation must begin &c. In Jude 14, 15, we read, "behold the Lord cometh, with ten thousand of his saints to execute judgment upon ALL" &c. Here is found the Greek word *Krisis*, the same translated damnation in Math. xxiii, 33, "how can ye escape the damnation of hell"; if then the latter is the proper rendering, the passage in Jude teaches *universal damnation*! damnation upon ALL being the pur-

pose of the coming of the Lord with ten thousand of his saints.

It will perhaps surprise the reader that there is so little mention made in the Bible of the phrases under consideration. Judging from the frequent use of such terms, by the clergy of the day, many are led to expect to find them in almost every page of the divine testimony. So far however, from this being the case, they are seldom found, and in not a solitary instance can their reference to the future and final destiny of man be be clearly established. On the other hand, *salvation* is the very common theme on which the sacred writers loved to dwell, the word occurring twenty times as often, perhaps, as its opposite.

SECTION II.—*EVERLASTING, FOREVER, &c.*

The original Greek words which are translated in the New Testament, are *Aion* and *Aionios*, the noun and the adjective, concerning which we have the following definitions:

"*Aion* is a compound of two words, *ai* and *on*, always being—it denotes duration or continuation of time, but with great variety." "The Hebrew *Olem* is the coresponding term for these two words (aion and aionios) in the Greek of the 70, which words denote *time hidden* from man, whether definite or indefinite, whether past or future."—PARKHURST.

"The Hebrew *Olem* and the Greek *Aion*, are both used to express a *limited* time, but, in general, a time the limits of which are *unknown*." Dr. A. CLARKE. (Methodist.)

"The words *Kedesh* and *od* (Hebrew) rendered by Turentine, eternity, are like the Greek *aion* that also signifies any thing *ancient*, which has endured, or is to endure for a long period." Professor STUART, (Presbyterian.)

"*Olem.*—This word is applied to time, and signifieth a duration which is concealed, as being of an unknown or great length, with respect to time past or to come." TAYLOR'S Hebrew Concordance.

"Had it been lawful to have coined a new word to express *aionion* in English, perhaps agical or age-lasting would have been near it." SCARLETT. On *aionios* the same translator says, "The word expresses duration or continuance; but it

is sometimes of a short and sometimes of a longer duration."

So much concerning the meaning of the noun and the adjective, from which it will appear that a strictly *endless* existence is not properly expressed by them. Nor, if we examine the translation of the primary word *ai*, which gives to *aion* its peculiar meaning, will we find the idea of *eternity* belonging to it. The following instances of the occurrence of the RADIX AI, in the New Testament, are selected to our hand :*

"Mark xv. 8—And the multitude crying aloud, began to desire him to do as he had (AEI) ever done unto them," i. e. uniformly since he (Pilate) had been governor—Acts vii. 51. —"Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do (AEI) always resist the Holy Spirit, as your fathers did, so do ye": i. e. ye do continually habitually, resist, &c. 2 Cor. iv. 11—"For we which live are (AEI) always delivered unto death," &c. i. e. constantly, at all times, liable to death. 2 Cor. vi. 10—"As sorrowful, yet (AEI) always rejoicing": i. e. continually. Tit. i. 12—The Cretans are (AEI) always liars"; i. e. habitually. Heb. iii. 10—They do (AEI) always err in their hearts"; i. e. uniformly, habitually. 1 Pet. iii. 15—"Be ready (AEI) always to give an answer to every man," &c. i. e. at all times, continually. 2 Pet. i. 12—"Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you (AEI) always in remembrance of these things"; i. e. constantly. These are all the places where AEI occurs in the New Testament, and not one of them does the word signify endlessly, or apply to any period beyond this state of being. And if neither of the two roots signifies endlessly, it is useless to attempt to prove that AION has the radical meaning of endless duration."

In addition to which, the following *facts* and reflections prove that the words translated *everlasting* and *eternal* in the scriptures, do, in no instance necessarily teach the idea of unlimited punishment :

1. The word *aion*, the noun, occurs about 120 times in the Greek Testament, and is translated, never, ages, world,

* Skinner's Letter to Campbell.

without end, course, eternal, ever, forever and forevermore, thus showing that it could not be translated uniformly by a definite word, expressive of perpetual existence. The substitution of English adverbs and adjectives for *nouns* by the translators, proves also, that they had no very clear ideas on the subject, or else that the word is susceptible of most marvellous transformations.

2. The word *aionios* occurs about 70 times, and is rendered with the like variation and disregard of the adjective form of the word.

3. The word *aion* is never translated *eternity*, as it might have been, had it that particular signification. Instead of this, however, we find the word *world* frequently used. For instance, Heb. ix. 26. "Now once *in the end of the world* hath he (Christ) appeared." This should have been rendered "in the *end of eternity*," provided *aion* thus signifies—which is absurd, as eternity can have no end. In Mathew xxviii. 20, we have another instance, "Lo, I am with you always, (or all days) even to the end of the world,"—to the *end* of eternity!

4. This rendering of *aion* by the term *world* would seem to have been designed to avoid the use of the proper English word *age*, which, in the above instance from Hebrews, and other places, is undoubtedly the correct translation. Christ appeared at the end of the Jewish age or dispensation—not at the end of this physical world. To show that the word *world* will not answer as the translation of *aion* or *aionios*, we need only refer to the question put to the Saviour, "Good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have *eternal* life?" In similar cases the word *world* is used in place of the word *eternal*. Let that rendering be given to this question, and what a singular one it would have been! "What good thing shall I do that I may have the *worldly* life? Answer—"If thou wilt enter into (worldly) life, keep the commandments." The fact that all shall be raised to immortal life, whether they keep the commandments or not, proves, furtheremore, that the life here spoken of was the life of the gospel by faith, enjoyed here upon the earth.

5. Eternity can have no beginning. Yet we find frequent instances of the words *aion* and *aionios* having such an idea attached thereto. In Ephesians iii. 9, Paul speaks of the fellowship of the mystery being hid in God "from the beginning of the world," literally, from the beginning of the eternities! So Peter in Acts iii. 21, "since the world began,"—since eternity began! So Titus i. 2, "promised before the world began." In these places the Greek word *Kosmos*, used to express the material globe, is not found, bnt the words translated everlasting and eternal. In this way it can be proved that eternity had a beginning as well as an end!

6. The words *aion* and *aionios* are used in the *plural* number, or to express the plurality of idea in many instances —signifying that there are more eternities than one, if these words are, with propriety, rendered eternity—thus: Math. xii. 32, "Neither in this world nor in the world to come,"—neither in this eternity nor in the one to come! Math. xiii. 22, "the cares of this world (eternity) choke the word;"—Gal. i. 5, "To whom be glory forever and ever," literally, for eternity of eternities! Rev. i. 6, "To him be glory and dominion forever and ever." Rev. x. 6, "And sware by him that liveth forever." xv. 7, "who liveth forever and ever." xx. 10, "day and night forever and ever," literally, for the *ever* of the *evers*—for the eternity of eternities and for the eternities of the eternities. If the singular should be rendered *ever*, of course, where there is a reduplication of the word, it must signify more than one, and be rendered by the plural number.

7. The addition sometimes made to the Hebrew word *gnolam* or olem, and to the Greek *aion* in the translation of the Old Testament by the 70 into Greek, is proof positive that, in their opinion, neither of these words, of themselves, denote unlimited duration. To give greater emphasis to the latter, the Greek particles ETI, (yet, still, further,) and EPE KEI NA, (further, beyond,) are added, to correspond with the Hebrew *le gnolam vegnad*, the phrase translated forever and ever, or, *for the age* and *beyond it*. In Exodus xv. 18, Daniel xii 3, and Micah iv 5, we have instances of this addi-

tion of particles, which literally read thus: "The Lord shall reign forever KAI ETI, and farther." "They shall shine as the stars forever, KAI ETI, and farther." "We will walk in the name of the Lord our God, forever, KAI EPEKEINA, and *beyond it.*" Now if the words *aion* and *gnolem*, of themselves, mean a strictly unlimited duration, or an eternity, then are the inspired writers made to speak of a time farther than, or beyond eternity!

8. The Romans borrowed their adverb OLIM from the Hebrew *olam*, and every Latin scholar knows that OLIM means *formerly*, or, *in times past.* In the Latin language, moreover, the word forever is a translation from IN SECULUM, to or for the age; for ever and ever, IN SECULUM SECULORUM, to the age of ages.

9. If the word EVER, in the English language had originally been supposed to teach a proper eternity, how came it to pass, that the compound words formed from it have no such signification? For instance, we have whoever, whosoever whencesoever, wherever, whenever, wheresoever, &c. In which the idea of endless duration is not once conceived. This will shed some light on the primary meaning of the words forever and ever, at the time the scriptures were translated.

10. Taking the common translation for our guide, we will find the words everlasting and eternal applied to things that *have already passed away!* For example: the land of Canaan was promised as an everlasting possession to the Israelites. The statutes of Israel, the priesthood of Aaron, and the covenant of circumcision were each called everlasting; If, therefore, the word everlasting is always to be understood in an unlimited sense, the gospel of Christ is thereby proven to be a fable, and the Jewish religion the only true system of Theology in the world; because, all Christians believe that Christianity is established on the ruins of the Legal dispensation. In the New Testament, also, we find frequent instances of the application of the phrases *everlasting* and *eternal* to things present. "He that believeth *hath* everlasting life,"

says Christ in John's Gospel, and "this *is* life eternal that they might know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" John v. 24; vi. 47; xvii. 3. The word being *limited* when applied to life—the life of faith in the Gospel—it must likewise be limited in the few cases in which it is connected with the consequences of sin.

11. The word everlasting is applied to life over 40 times in the New Testament, while it is found once only in connexion with each of the words punishment, destruction, condemnation and judgment.

12. The application of the phrase to Deity or his atributes does not prove any thing in relation to the duration of God, for when we admit the Being of Jehovah, his ETERNITY follows as a matter of course, nor will the use of any word add to this attribute of his nature. Unless, therefore, it can be made to appear that endless duration follows as necessarily from the existence of misery as from the existence of God, the application of the word everlasting to the perfections of the Almighty can afford no support to the idea of endless torment.

The conclusion of the whole matter is, that an ETERNITY of DURATION is no where expressed by the word *aion* and *aionios*, translated everlasting, eternal, &c. in the Scriptures, The life immortal, indissoluble and incorruptible is expressed by totally different words in the original languages—words too, that are of strictly endless signification, but which are *never* found in connexion with death, punishment, hell, or any other term expressive of the penalty due to sin!

SECTION IV.—*DESTRUCTION, DESTROY.*

These words have a variety of significations in the Scriptures. In some places they seem to be used synonymously with *death*, or the *grave*, as in Psalm xc. 3, "thou turnest man to destruction," and xci. 6, "destruction that wasteth at noon day." Other instances of their occurrence seem to teach the *annihilation* of the person or thing to which they are applied, as in Math. v. 17, "I am not come to *destroy*

but to fulfil;" 1 John iii. 8, "might *destroy* the works of the devil;" Hosea xiii. 14, "O grave, I will be thy *destruction*." Again, The signification of desolation or tribulation is found connected therewith, as in Hosea iv. 6, "My people are *destroyed* for lack of knowledge," and xii. 9, "Oh Israel, thou *hast destroyed* thyself, but in me is thy help." This destruction was therefore not eternal, as there was help therefrom to be found in the Lord. In one place, 1 Cor. v. 5, the word destruction appears to convey the idea of subjugation or control; "Deliver such an one unto Satan for the *destruction* o the flesh that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus," that is, the *mortification* or *subjection* of the fleshly propensities, &c.

In no instance but one, (2 Thes. i. 9,) is the word used in any connection, which is supposed to teach or imply the doctrine of endless misery. In this case, the word everlasting (aionion) is appended, and if understood in its utmost extent will not prove the doctrine of interminable woe, but the *annihilation* or blotting out of existence of those thus punished, because, if a soul is ETERNALLY *destroyed* it cannot at the same time live forever, a monument of ceaseless suffering!

SECTION V.—*PERISH, PERDITION.*

Perish. This word is usually applied in a sense expressive of desolation or temporal death. For example: in Gen. xli. 36, the food gathered in Egypt, by order of Joseph, was that "the *land* might not perish through famine," or, the people of the land. Again, in Lev. xxvi. 38, Jehovah threatens the people of Israel that they should "perish among the heathen," as one of the many sore temporal judgments he would inflict upon them, if they did not hearken and obey his voice. In Esther iv. 16, the resolution of the queen to go in unto the king in behalf of her kindred, which was "not according to law," was couched in the same phraseology. "If I perish, I perish," said she, which, of course, could not convey the idea of any thing else than temporal death, as the hazard she incurred, in thus intruding upon the presence of King Ahasuerus.

And where the word perish is found as the opposite of *eternal life*, in John iii. 15, &c. it has one and the same signification with *spiritual death*, for this is frequently contrasted with *life* by the apostle Paul. Says Christ, "He that believeth shall not *perish* but have everlasting life." He also says, "He that believeth *hath* everlasting life," that is, everlasting or eternal life is the *present* possession of the believer. This life is therefore limited—being an enjoyment here upon the earth—the present consequence of faith in the gospel of the Son of God. It follows as a matter of certainty, that the opposite of this eternal life—to *perish*—is likewise limited in its nature. As the apostle Paul remarks, "The wages of sin *is* death, but the gift of God *is* eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord," and "to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace."

Perdition. This is a translation, in some instances, of the Greek *apoleia*, rendered destruction. The Latin *perdido*, from which perdition is derived, has the signification of the English word *lose*. For example: a "son of perdition," is one that is *lost* in sin and wickedness; but that is no reason why such characters will not finally be saved, inasmuch as Christ came to "seek and save that which was *lost*." Math. xviii. 11. He came to the *lost* sheep of the house of Israel." x. 6. The "prodigal son" was *lost;* so also the piece of silver, and so likewise the hundredth sheep, but all these were found. Their being *lost* was the very best reason why they should be looked after and saved from their perilous condition. So in relation to the human family. We have "*all* gone astray like *lost sheep*," but *the lost* shall be found and gathered into the fold of Christ, and "there shall be *one* fold and one shepherd."

Section VI.—*FIRE, HELL-FIRE.*

In days gone by, there was a great deal of alarm excited, in the minds of the fearful and unbelieving, by the use of these terms. Then the place of torment, in a future world, was a *bona fide* lake of fire and brimstone—a material and substantial flame—an unquenchable burning, and at the same

time a place of darkness, of smoke and intolerable heat. *Now*, the people have rejected such notions, and the priests, in the true spirit of accommodation, have conjured up a hell in a future world, of an entirely different character. Instead of a local literal hell of combustible materials, they have invented a hell of conscience, or a mental hell—a state of inconceivable mental anguish being supposed to await the impenitent sons of men, in eternity. Well! this is something more reasonable than to suppose that *immaterial spirits* can be tormented in *material fire and flames*, but what then becomes of all those passages which speak of fire and burnings as coming upon the disobedient and rebellious? They must be interpreted, according to a different standard of faith, from that by which they have usually been explained; and the truth is, whenever such phrases are no longer supposed to teach the old fashioned notions concerning the nature of hell, there will be little difficulty in arriving at correct conclusions on the subject.

The word *fire* is used literally and figuratively—in the former sense, when we read of "fire and brimstone being rained down from heaven" on the Sodomites. Gen. xix. 24. But when we peruse the account of a "fire in Zion," Isaiah xxxi. 9, and of the gathering of the house of Israel "into the *midst of Jerusalem*, as they gather silver, and gold, and iron, and lead, and tin into the midst of the furnace, to blow *the fire* upon it to melt it," Ezekiel xxii. 18–22, and likewise of the judgments coming upon Idumea, whose "streams should be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof burning pitch—which *should not be quenched* night nor day—the smoke thereof to go up forever." Is. xxxiv. 9–10. We are to understand such descriptions *figuratively*, as expressive of the awful temporal retributions coming upon those who were thus threatened. So, when we read of "unquenchable fire," and hell fire—the fire of Gehenna—in two or three places in the New Testament, we interpret by the same rule of prophetic application. If the Prophets of the Most High God used such language

in reference to temporal woe and present doom, we are at liberty to infer that our Lord used it in the same sense, especially as it was foretold of him, that he should "suddenly come to his temple," and be "like a refiner's fire," &c.

But there are other significations of the term *fire* in the scriptures. For example: we are commanded to "heap *coals of fire* on the heads of our enemies," in order to melt them and subdue them—that is, render them good for evil, and feel the fire of Love in our hearts, and express it in our actions, towards those who hate us. Again: the word of the Lord is said to be like unto a *fire*, Jer. xxiii. 29, and God is said to be a "consuming fire," Heb. xii. 29, which shall consume the "hay and stubble" of iniquity; for "every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by *fire;* and the *fire* shall try every man's work, what sort it is," * * * * and "if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be *saved*, yet so as by *fire*." 1 Cor. iii. 13–15. In the language of the prophet Isaiah, "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring *fire*? Who among us us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously and speaketh uprightly," &c. xxxiii. 14, 15. Let the fearful then be no longer faithless but believing. The *righteous* are to dwell in the presence of God who "is a consuming fire," and His Love shall be as a "wall of fire round about" them forever.

We now come to comment briefly upon various passages in the scriptures which have been supposed to teach the doctrine of enless woe; and our purpose is the rather to show that this sentiment is *not* inculcated, than to give a full exposition of the true meaning of the texts which may come under consideration: In the Old Testament there only a few passages which are worthy of notice, as but little reliance is now placed upon its teachings in relation to a future life, for the plain reason that "*life* and *immortality* were brought to light through the *Gospel*," and were not revealed under the first covenant. Of course, then, if a future state was not re-

vealed in the legal Dispensation, the doctrine of eternal torments in that state could not have been the subject of revelation therein. Nevertheless, it falls within our province to touch upon a few texts which are sometimes quoted from the Bible, by the uninformed, in proof of that dogma.

SECTION VII.

"But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely *die*." Gen. ii. 17.

This text has generally been supposed to declare the endless death of the sinner. "Man, by the *fall*, (says the Catechism) lost communion with God, became liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and to the pains of hell forever," or, in other words, became subject to 'death temporal, death spiritual, and death eternal.' It strikes us, however, that this interpretation of the text not only falsifies the record, but impeacheth the veracity of Jehovah himself! The punishment threatened was *death*, and the time when it was to be inflicted was *in the day* of transgression, and that there was no escape therefrom, is made manifest by the phrase *surely*. Now, did God speak the truth? Did Adam die any death on the day he ate of the fruit of the tree of knowledge? He certainly did, if the Almighty fulfilled his threatening—yet, it is clear he did not die a *natural* death on the day threatened, inasmuch as he lived 930 years, (chap. v. 5.) a great part of which time elapsed after his banishment from Eden! Nor could he have died a 'death eternal,' or suffered the 'pains of hell forever,' ON THE DAY he transgressed, because this doom is not supposed to be endured until after the death of the body! What death then did Adam die? We answer, a 'death in trespasses and sins,'—a death to innocence—just such a death as St. Paul speaks of in Rom. viii. 6, 'for to be carnally minded *is death*,' and in vii. 9, 'I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came sin revived and I *died*.' Besides, were we to admit that 'death eternal' is taught in the text, it would not prove *partial* but *universal damnation*, as the apostle says, that 'as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so

death passed on *all* men, for that all have sinned.' Rom. v. 12. One of two alternatives is therefore before us, either to allow that Deity actually inflicted the death threatened, *on the day* of the violation of his law, or that the sentence of endless death has passed upon *all*. For there is no escape from the doom threatened. All who sin will as '*surely*' die as did Adam, in the day of their departure from the path of virtue.

Look, too, at the sentence of the Supreme Judge, pronounced upon the delinquent *after* his transgression. 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: * * * In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, TILL THOU RETURN TO THE GROUND, for out of it wast thou taken, for dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return.' Gen. iii. 16, 19. Here then, the penalty is limited to the lifetime of Adam—until he returned to the ground! and not a syllable further have we on the subject, except the reason assigned in the 22d verse for his being turned out of the garden—'*lest* he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever,' which certainly implies that he would not live forever without this additional act on his part. From all which it would appear, that mortality was the original doom of man, and that he did not become mortal in consequence of sinning. We are also certified that the doctrines of total depravity, original sin, and endless death, drawn from this portion of the Divine Testimony are all as 'baseless as the fabric of a vision.'

SECTION VIII.

"See, I have set before thee, this day, life and good, death and evil." Deut. xxx. 15.

This text is frequently quoted by Arminians, in proof of the freedom of choice to man in matters appertaining to his future welfare; but it will only be necessary to read the next verse in connection, to show its limited nature—'In that I command thee, this day, to love the Lord thy God, &c. that thou mayest live and multiply; and the Lord thy God shall bless thee *in the land* whither thou goest to possess it.'

SECTION IX.

"The wicked shall be turned into *hell*, and all the nations that forget God." Psalms ix. 17.

This is one place where the word *Sheol* occurs in the Hebrew, and it may be understood *figuratively* to represent the troubles which inevitably comes upon the wicked, or, *literally*, as expressive of that sudden death which often befals the abandoned, in their vicious career. This, we have seen, was the opinion of the Hebrews—that the wicked were 'driven suddenly' into Sheol, while the 'good descended into it in tranquility and in the fulness of their years.' The former idea is perhaps the most correct, as *nations* as well as individuals were to experience the doom threatened. Perhaps the word 'desolation,' which Dr. Clarke uses as expressive of the fate of Capernaum, (Math. xi. 23, 'brought down to *hell*,') will apply here with the same force.

But if it is contended otherwise, it will not answer the partialist in support of his creed, for it proves too much. The Psalmist, in chap. xiv. 2, 3, speaks his opinion thus concerning the corruption of the human race: 'The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' An apostle has said also, that 'we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God,' and 'if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' All then are *wicked*, and the wicked *shall* be turned into hell. The language is positive. God 'will *by no means* clear the guilty.' All then are under the same condemnation, 'our enemies themselves being judges.'

SECTION X.

"I also will laugh at your calamity and mock when your fear cometh." Prove bs i. 26

We have heard this language applied to Deity, in reference to his final treatment of the impenitent. A slight attention to the context will show, however, that *Wisdom* was the speaker, who 'uttereth her voice in the streets,' and that it is a gross perversion of the scriptures to force the passage into

support of the endless wretchedness of the sinner. (See verse 20.)

SECTION XI.

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Exekiel xviii. 4.

The Prophet in the use of this sentiment, was combatting the Jewish Proverb that "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge"; and Jehovah declared, that there should be no more occasion to use this proverb in Israel, for all souls are his. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son,—'the soul that sinneth, *it* shall die.' What that death was, may be ascertained from our remarks on Gen. ii 17. and from the context of the passage under consideration.

SECTION XII.

"And many of them which sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Daniel, xii. 2.

The verse preceeding describes the time when the event here recorded was to take place:—'when Michael should stand up, the great Prince which standeth for the children of thy people.' It will be conceded, that the Prophet had reference here, to Christ. The allusion to the 'taking away of the daily sacrifice,' in the 11th verse of the same chapter, proves that reference; and the quotation, by our Saviour, in Mat. xxiv. 23, of the language of Daniel, and his pointed application of this prophecy to the calamities then about to fall upon Jerusalem, in the 15th, 16th, and succeeding verses, where he says, "then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains," &c. will settle, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the meaning of the text. A moral resurrection to a life of faith in the Gospel of Christ, and to the condemnation of unbelief, (see John v. 25, 28, & 29,) was certainly intended by the inspired penman.

SECTION XIII.

"O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come." Math. iii. 7.

This language was addressed by John the Baptist to the

Pharisees and Saducees, and is supposed by the most eminent Commentators, to refer to the destruction coming upon the Jews. Bishop *Pearce* says, the 'wrath to come' means the 'punishment to come in the destruction of the Jewish state.' *Kenrick*—'the impending punishment in the destruction of the Jewish state'. *Dr. A. Clarke.*—'the desolation which was about to fall on the Jewish nation.' Such is the testimony of the standard authorities of the Limitarian Churches.

SECTION XIV.

"He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Math. iii. 12. Luke, iii. 17.

It is supposed by many that the righteous are here intended by the wheat and the wicked by the chaff—the former to be gathered into the garner of heaven, at the last day, and the latter to be burned up with unquenchable fire, in the prison-house of hell. And suppose we admit the idea, for a moment. What advantage will it give the opponents of universal grace? None truly, for it will then be hard to prove, from this or any other passage, that the wicked being burned up in unquenchable flames, even as chaff, will continue to exist, in a consuming yet unconsumed state, throughout eternity! Similar language, moreover, is applied to temporal things, as will appear by a reference to the sixth section of this chapter. By the chaff, Dr. Clarke understands the 'rebellious Jews,' and by 'unquenchable fire', one that 'cannot be extinguished by *man*.' And this view is entertained by other commentators, of the endless punishment school.

SECTION XV.

"Therefore I say unto you, that whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." Mat. v. 22.

Here are three different degrees of punishment, for as many offences, differing but little in their nature, only one of which is supposed, however, to relate to a future world. This, of itself, ought to be sufficient to show the inconsistency between the creeds of men and the teachings of Christ, for it

is commonly supposed, that 'hell-fire' is the appropriate doom of the little as well as the great sinner, if they die impenitent. But here there is an infinite distinction in the punishment of actions, which seem to us to vary but little, in moral turpitude! How is this? The matter cannot be explained satisfactorily on the supposition, that 'hell-fire,' in the text, refers to the future world. But in view of the fact, that the phrase *hell* is a translation of Gehenna—a proper noun which means the 'Valley of Hinnom,' the difficulty vanishes at once. The whole matter is then seen to apply to the different punishments among the Jews, as thus correctly described by Dr. Clarke, in his notes on this passage:

"*Shall be in danger of hell-fire—shall be liable to the hell of fire.* Our Lord here alludes to the valley of the Son of Hinnom. This place was near Jerusalem, and had been formerly used for those abominable sacrifices, in which the idolatrous Jews has caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch. A particular place in this valley was called Tophet, the fire-stove, in which some suppose they burnt their children alive to the above idol." He further says, after speaking of the three offences noted in the text—"now, proportioned to these three offences were three different degrees of punishment, each exceeding the other in its severity, as the offences exceeded each other in their different degrees of guilt. 1. The *Judgment*, the council of twenty-three, which could inflict the punishment of *strangling*. 2. The *Sanhedrin*, or great council, which could inflict the punishment of *stoning*. And 3, the being *burnt alive* in the valley of the Son of Hinnom. This appears to be the meaning of our Lord."

Dr. Parkhurst, the author of a Greek Lexicon, says that the phrase translated hell-fire, literally Gehenna of fire, does, 'in in its outward and primary sense, relate to that dreadful doom of being burnt alive in the valley of Hinnom'; and Dr. *Macknight* says, 'the valley of Hinnom, called also Tophet, was the scene of the detestable worship of Moloch, that horrid idol, to whom the Israelites burnt their children alive, as

sacrifices. In after times, continual fires were kept in this valley for burning the unburied carcasses and filth of the city, that being thus polluted, it might be unfit for the like religious abominations.' So also Rosenmuller, Wakefield and others. Notwithstanding this explicit testimony, we find these very same commentators understand the word Gehenna figuratively to denote the doom of the damned in a future world. That it is used figuratively we doubt not, but that it is ever applied to the retributions of eternity cannot be made to appear. No figure can ever be of stronger signification than the reality from which it is taken. Hence an endles hell can never be figuratively set forth by a word, which all admit to be of local application in its primary signification.

SECTION XVI.

"And if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee, that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." Math. v. 29, 30. xviii. 8, 9. Mark ix. 43, 48.

Understanding this passage in a literal sense, and as referring to a future and immortal life, it would teach that plucking out a right eye or cutting off a right hand might be the means of saving the whole body from being cast into hell, an idea which none will admit, for a moment. To interpret it as referring to some cherished sin, which ought rather to be cut off than to endanger the soul, would imply that a man may enter heaven with some sins, (or members) if he only cuts off the offending one. Or, as the parallel passages have it—a man may enter into the resurrection state *halt* or *maimed*—that is, with one eye, hand, or foot! The phrase, "It is better to enter into life halt or maimed," certainly teaches this absurdity, if the word *life* means *heaven*. Again, if plucking out the eye, and cutting off the hand or foot, signifies parting with some possession, dear as those members, and this is necessary to secure *endless life*, then it would seem that we can reach the eternal world, having with us other possessions equally dear to us as those we have parted with—for the

remaining hand, foot, and eye, would bear the same interpretation! Furthermore, by parting with an offending member (or possession) and retaining its counterpart, it is represented that a man may have possessions both in heaven and in hell! And if it be true, that 'where a man's treasure is, there will his heart be also,' there will, we opine, be many an anxious look from the battlements of heaven after the lost possessions in the regions below!

All these ridiculous conclusions can however be obviated by confining the text to its proper reference—which is, that it were better to give up all earthly possessions rather than fail of an entrance into the enjoyments of that 'everlasting life' which is the present result of faith in the Gospel of Christ, or, in other words, it were better to part with every thing which would interfere with the duties of a Christian disciple, rather than, by keeping any cherished possession, to expose themselves to the signal destruction threatened against the rebellious. The fact that the early Christians heeded the signs of danger given to them, and escaped the calamities (set forth by the phrase Gehenna, translated hell) in which Judea was involved, corroborates this view of the subject.

SECTION XVII.

"Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." Math. vii. 13, 14. Luke xiii. 23, 24.

This instruction, as recorded by Luke, was in reply to the interrogatory of one of the hearers of the Saviour—'Lord, are there few that be *saved?*' And hence, the supposition that the salvation spoken of was the salvation of a future world, and the inference from the answer of Christ, that there were many who would never reach the abodes of bliss. This conclusion is, however, based on the popular mistake, that in every place, in the Bible, where the words *saved* and *salvation* occur, they relate to a deliverance from an endless hell, when the truth is, they *never* have any such idea attached to them in a single instance!

The phrase *the saved*, was usually applied to the early Christians in the present tense, as in 1 Cor. i. 18, 'But unto us who *are saved*, it is the power of God.' So also in Acts ii. 47, 'the Lord added to the church daily (literally) *the saved*.' Again in Acts xxviii. 28, we are informed that salvation '*is sent* to the Gentiles,' and in Luke xix. 9, 'this day is salvation come unto this house.' In these places a present salvation from sin and moral evil is undoubtedly meant. The purport of the query was then, probably, as follows: 'Are there few who will embrace the religion you teach, or many?' Christ answers him, 'Strive to enter the *strait gate*.' The term *gate* was a common Jewish figure to represent 'that which lets or leads men into the sense and knowledge of any doctrine,' according to Bishop Pearce, and, in the text, means that door or gate which lets men into the Gospel or Kingdom of Christ. The taking up a profession of Christianity, in the days of Christ, was aptly called entering a 'strait gate,' to portray the difficulties that were then to be encountered by Christians, on account of the prejudices and errors of the age, to all of which the religion of Jesus was opposed. On the contrary, the Scribes, Pharisees, High Priests and people were in the broad way to destruction.

Bishop Kenrick says, that 'believing in Christ is with propriety called *being saved*, because it was attended with temporal deliverance; whereas, unbelief produced inevitable destruction in the calamities which awaited the Jewish nation. Christ, therefore, in his answer to the question, exhorts the person who made it, and others who might hear it, to enter the *strait gate*, that is to embrace *his* religion, which was then attended with many difficulties, and which might fitly be compared to entering a strait or narrow passage; and he enforces this exhortation by assuring them that the time would come, when many would seek an entrance into the kingdom of the Messiah, but would be refused admission!'

Dr. A. Clarke says: 'Enter in through this strait gate—i. e. *of doing to every one as you would he should do unto you*; for this ALONE seeems to be the strait gate,' &c.

SECTION XVIII.

"Verily I say unto you it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, *in the day of judgment*, than for that city." Mat. x. 15.

As paralell to this passage, may be cited Mathew, xi. 22; Mark vi. 11; Luke x. 12.—in all of which, the doctrine of a day of judgment, in eternity, is supposed to be inculcated. But Commentators, of celebrity, who were believers in that dogma, do not so understand the phrase in the text. Dr. Clarke says: 'In the day of Judgment or punishment: Perhaps not meaning the day of general judgment, nor the day of the destruction of the Jewish state by the Romans; but a day in which God should send *punishment* on that particular city, or that person, for their crimes: so the day of judgment of Sodom and Gomorrah, was the time in which the Lord destroyed them by fire and brimstone, out of heaven.' Bishop Pearce refers the passage to the destruction of the Jewish state, and says that the sense appears to be, that the punishment which befel Sodom and Gomorrah was more tolerable than what should befal Jerusalem. And this view of the subject is confirmed by what Christ says concerning the *tribulation* coming upon that city, 'such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.' Mat xxiv. 21.

SECTION XIX.

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Mat. x. 28. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body but after that, have no more that they can do: but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.' Luke xii. 4. 5.

We have at length arrived at a text, which is confessedly, one of the most difficult in the Bible, to explain in such a manner, as will at once remove prejudice from the mind and introduce it into the light of truth. But we are not without hope, that even this *gordian knot* may be unloosed, and its mysterious entanglements clearly unravelled, without dishonor to the character of God, or reproach to the record of inspiration.

It is commonly supposed that the text teaches the notion that the Almighty is determined to destroy or torment the immortal souls of the impenitent, as well as their bodies, in an endless hell. This sentiment is liable to the following objections:

1. It is not clear that by the word *him*, in the text, Jehovah was intended—because Christ was, on this very occasion, addressing his own beloved disciples, and instructing them to repose implicit confidence in the fatherly care and protection of the Almighty! He enjoined them to provide nothing for the mission on which they were about to depart, as the workman was worthy of his meat. He also pointed out to them the trifling value of the 'two sparrows,' which were sold for a farthing—yet which could not fall to the ground without the notice of their Father; and then emphatically taught them that they were 'of more value than many sparrows,'—that the 'hairs of their heads were all numbered,' and that they therefore should '*fear not.*' If, then, this phrase, 'fear him,' in the text, refers to Deity, there is a palpable contradiction in the language of Christ, in the space of three short verses of the same discourse!

2. The beloved disciples were not in danger of an endless hell. They were Christian believers, and of course were known to Christ as the heirs of eternal life and glory. How then was it probable that *they* should thus be threatened with the doom of endless woe!

3. If it is admitted that Jehovah was alluded to, it will not prove that he *will* destroy both soul and body in hell, for the language is 'fear him who is *able* to destroy,' &c. God is *able*, out of the stones of the street to raise up children unto Abraham, (Math. iii. 9,) but did he do it? He was *able* also to send to the aid of Christ 'more than twelve legions of angels,' (Math. xxvi. 53.) but he did not do it. We are certified, moreover, that God's *will* is entirely the reverse of such destruction. He has *willed* that 'all men shall be *saved*,' not destroyed. He hath *willed* that "all should be gathered together in Christ" their head, and *not* that they shall eternally perish.

4. If we allow God *will* punish guilty men in an endless hell, the text does not prove the doctrine, because it reads, 'who is able to *destroy* both soul and body,' &c. Now, if soul and body are both destroyed, the individual is *annihilated*, not tormented forever! And all the ingenuity of men cannot make it appear, that a being can be totally destroyed, yet live forever, in unutterable torments.

5. The word rendered *soul*, in the text, does not mean the *spirit*, or immortal part of man, in any instance. This word is *psuche*, and is elsewhere translated *life*, as in the 39th verse: 'He that findeth his *life* shall lose it, and he that loseth his *life*, for my sake, shall find it.' Also, in John xiii. 37, where Peter's language to Christ is recorded: 'I will lay down my *life* for thy sake.' In these cases it will appear certain that the word *soul*, in its present acceptation, would not have been a correct rendering, for that would indicate, that 'he who found his immortal soul should lose it,' and Peter would be made to say, that he would 'lay down his immortal soul' for Christ, and Paul, that he 'did not count his immortal soul dear unto himself,' Acts xx. 24, and Christ, that he came to 'give his immortal soul a ransom for many.'

6. The text speaks of destroying both soul and body in the self-same place, to wit: in hell. Now, we all know where the bodies of men will be destroyed. 'Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return,' is the doom of man; and if the soul is to be destroyed in the same place with the body, this destruction was to take place in the grave, not in a lake that burneth with fire and brimstone!

7. The word *Hell*, in the text, is *Gehenna* in the Greek, which we have already seen, means, primarily, the 'valley of Hinnom,' near Jerusalem, and figuratively, the sore judgments coming upon the rebellious Jews, *in time*, not in eternity.

So much, then, as to what the passage does not mean. Now, a few thoughts as to what it does mean. The whole design of the Saviour's discourse appears to have been that of warning to the disciples against the cruelty and malice of

the Jews. In the 16th verse of the same chapter, he says unto them, 'Behold I send you forth, as sheep in the midst of wolves,' &c. 'But beware of *men;* for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will *scourge* you in their synagogues,' 17. This advice was accompanied with the assurance, that notwithstanding the persecutions they should suffer, their Heavenly Father would sustain them in all their trials. Taking this fact into consideration, we may arrive at the fair conclusion, that the *ruling power* among the Jewish people, at this juncture, was the enemy alluded to in the phrase 'fear him.' By a reference to John xviii. 31, we find that the power of 'putting to death,' did not remain in the hands of the Jews—'It is not lawful for us to put any man to death,' said they to Pilate. About forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem, this power was taken from the Jews and lodged in the hands of the Roman Emperor. They had power, however, to 'scourge,' or *torture,* which is one meaning of the Greek word rendered *kill* in the text, according to DONNEGAN'S Greek and English Lexicon. SCHLEUSNER, another respectable authority, gives the meaning of said word, '*to make miserable or unhappy,*' according to which definition the text may be paraphrased as follows:

'And fear not them so much who only scourge or torture the body, but are not able to take the life, as him (or that power) which is able to destroy both life and body in Gehenna,'—or, as Luke has it, 'Fear him which *after he hath killed,* hath power to cast into Gehenna.' xii. 4, 5. The fact that 600,000 dead bodies were actually cast out into this 'valley of Hinnom,' during the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, by the Roman army, and the additional truth that the early Christians were exposed to the calamities coming upon the house of Israel, and only escaped the impending doom, by heeding the signs given to them and escaping to the mountains, would seem to be sufficient evidence, on which to rest our convictions, that Christ had no reference whatever to the retributions which the Almighty meant to inflict in eternity.

SECTION XX.

"Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men.

And whosoever speaketh against the Son of man it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Mat. xii. 31, 32; Mark iii. 29; Luke xii. 10.

This text has often been quoted in proof of the doctrine of an 'unpardonable sin,' and many a poor victim has been immolated on the shrine of error and delusion thus set up. The whole difficulty of the passage arises, however, from a mistranslation of a single word. That word is *aion*, rendered forever, everlasting, &c. in other places, and *world* in the text. *Kosmos*, the proper Greek term for the physical world or universe of matter, is not here found. If we give the Greek *aion* therefore its usual signification, according to our common version, we would read that the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost would not be forgiven in this *eternity*, neither in the *eternity* to come! The true reading is *age*, or dispensation, having reference to the Jewish or legal age and the Christian or gospel age. This is the opinion of all commentators that we have had any opportunity of examining. The testimony of Dr. A. Clarke is added, in order to convince some of his unlearned brethren in the faith, that 'they do err, not knowing the scriptures,' when they attempt to frighten their fellow beings, with the danger of committing a sin *unpardonable* in its nature.

On the phrase, *neither in this world, &c.* Dr. Clarke thus remarks:—'Though I follow the common translation yet I am fully satisfied the meaning of the words is, neither in this dispensation, viz., the Jewish, nor in that which is to come, viz., the Christian. *Olam ha-bo, the world to come*, is a constant phrase for the times of the Messiah, in the Jewish writers. The sin here spoken of by our Lord ranks high in the catalogue of *presumptuous sins*, for which there was no forgiveness under the Mosaic dispensation. See Num. xv. 30, 31, xxxv. 31, Lev. xx. 10, 1 Sam. ii. 25. When

our Lord says that such a sin hath no forgiveness, is he not to be understood as meaning that the crime shall be punished under the Christian dispensation as it was under the Jewish, viz: by the destruction of the body? And is not this the same mentioned 1 John v. 16, called there the *sin unto death*, i. e. a sin that was to be punished by the death of the body, while mercy might extend to the soul? The punishment for presumptuous sins under the Jewish law, to which our Lord evidently alludes, certainly did not extend to the *damnation of the soul*, though the body was destroyed; therefore I think that, though there was no such forgiveness to be extended to this crime as to absolve the man from the punishment of *temporal* death, yet, *on repentance*, mercy might be extended to the soul; and every sin may be repented of under the gospel dispensation.'

SECTION XXI.

—— "So shall it be, in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity: And shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth."

"So shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked fr m among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire, there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Math. xiii. 41, 42—49, 50.

These passages conclude the parables of the *Sower* and the *Net*, and have manifestly one and the same reference, viz: the respective dooms of the righteous and the wicked at a particular period, then future. The common opinion is that *the end* of this *material world*, and the awful retributions consequent on that end, are here set forth. But a little examination will show that this is an erroneous view of the subject. 1. Christ remarks that the 'kingdom of heaven was likened unto a man who sowed good seed in his field, but while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat.' Now this proves one of two things, either that the phrase 'kingdom of heaven,' signifies the gospel dispensation, or kingdom of Christ here upon the earth, *or*, that the enemy of man had power to sow tares, or wicked persons, in

the kingdom of glory in another world! The latter idea is absurd—the former is undoubtedly true. 2. The *world* which was to have an end was *not* the 'field' in which the seed was sown! The Greek word first translated world is *Kosmos*, which means the physical globe or universe, but we have no account of *this* world coming to an end, but another. The 'harvest is the end of the *world*'; 'So shall it be at the end of this *world*.' Here the word *aion* is found in the original text, (not *Kosmos* before mentioned,) and should have had a different translation altogether—to wit: *age* or dispensation. The reader will bear in mind that this *aion* is the same word translated everlasting, forever, &c. and which is supposed to mean a strict *eternity*. If so, the passage under consideration should read thus: 'The harvest is the end of the *eternity*.' 'So shall it be at the end of *this eternity*.' It is the same word translated *world* in Math. xii. 31, 32, as explained in the previous section. Dr. Wakefield thus comments: 'The harvest is the *conclusion of this age*, and the reapers are the messengers; as therefore the weeds are picked out and burned up with a fire, so shall it also be in the *conclusion of this age*.' Dr. A. Clarke renders end of the world (v. 39, 40,) '*end of the age*—Jewish polity.' So also Dr. M'Night. Dr. Campbell translates it the 'conclusion of the state.' Bishop Pearce says, on verse 40, 'End of this world. Rather end of this age, viz: that of the Jewish Dispensation.' And Dr. Hammond translates it, 'conclusion of this age.' The furnace 'of fire' has been already explained in a previous section; and to show that the phraseology 'cast into outer darkness, where shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth,' does not prove the reference of the parables under consideration to a future world, the reader is referred to Mat. viii. 12, where it is said, that the '*children* of the *kingdom* shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.' This, compared with Mathew xxiv. 29–34, will show that the Jews were thus called 'children of the kingdom,' and that those things were to take place, even before that 'generation,' then upon the earth, 'should pass away.'

SECTION XXII.

"For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own Soul? or, what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" Math. xvi. 26; Mark viii. 36, 37; Luke ix. 25.

Who is there that has not heard a great deal said about the value of the 'immortal soul' of man, and about the danger of losing the same, eternally? 'The soul! the soul! the never dying soul!' is the prolific theme of many a pulpit harangue, and this text is the basis of the terrific eloquence, thus called forth. A simple remark, however, is only necessary to show that there is more *sound* than *sense* in such appeals to the fears and apprehensions of mortals. And that remark is this:—the Greek word rendered *soul*, in the text, is the same which is twice rendered *life* in the verse preceding, and which last, all Lexicographers and Commentators of standing, acknowledge to be the correct rendering of the Greek *Psuche*. Thus rendered, the passage would read, 'For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own *life*, or what shall a man give in exchange for his *life*.' Here then there would be no question as to the true meaning of the passage, for all can understand that the world has no value in the eyes of any one, in comparison with his life. Dr. A. Clarke, in commenting on the text, says as follows: '*Lose his own soul*; or, *lose his life*. On what authority many have translated the word *psuche*, in the 25th verse, *life*, and in this verse, *soul*, I know not; but am certain it means life, in both places. If a man should gain the whole world, its riches, honors and pleasures, and lose his *life*, what would all these profit him, seeing they can only be enjoyed during *life*?

SECTION XXIII.

"Thus said the King to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Math. xxii. 13.

There is a parallel to this in Luke xiv. 16, 24, and the design appears to have been to teach the rejection of the Jewish people, once the chosen people of God, from their peculiar privileges, and the introduction of the Gentiles into the enjoy-

ments of the gospel. 'Being cast in utter darkness,' has the same signification here as in Math. viii. 12, and in the conclusion of the parables of the net and the tares. See also, Luke xiii. 26, 30, where similar language is used to the Jews expressive of the truth that 'the first (themselves) should be last and the last (the Gentiles) should be first.' Then look at Romans xi. 11-32, and learn the 'depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God,' in that he hath 'concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.' 'For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever. Amen.'

SECTION XXIV.

"Therefore ye shall receive the greater damnation."

"Ye make him two-fold more the child of *hell* than yourselves." Math. xxiii. 14, 15.

By receiving 'greater damnation,' is meant receiving more severe punishment than other Jews;—and by the phrase 'child of hell,' is meant a person more wicked, and consequently more deserving of punishment, than those who converted him. 'Child of hell,' and 'Son of perdition,' according to Wynne, were terms of reproach among the Jews. The child or son of any thing, according to an idiom among the Hebrews, may be either what is closely connected with it, dependent on it, like it, the consequence of it, worthy of it, &c. as for instance, the 'Son of Belial;' a worthless fellow—the Son of consolation;' one that imparts consolation—'Son of misfortune;' one in trouble—'Son of thunder;' a man of powerful and energetic eloquence, &c.

SECTION XXV.

"Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Math. xxiii. 33.

The word *Gehenna* occurs in this passage, and it is therefore to be understood in accordance with the explanations previously given of said original term. Bishop Pearce and Theophylact understand the phrase, '*damnation of hell*,' as the judgment or punishment to be endured by the Jews when their polity should be destroyed.

SECTION XXVI.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.

* * * * * * * * * *

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Math. xxv. 31—46.

We have now come to a very important portion of the sacred record—one that is daily brought forward to prove *a day of judgment in eternity*, and the final separation of the righteous and the wicked—the latter to 'go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal,' that is: the one to depart into an endless hell, and the other into an endless heaven! Such is the popular opinion, which we think is easily proven to be directly in contradiction to the testimony of Christ himself, on this subject. To arrive at the true meaning of the parable, we will first inquire, *When* were all the events, here recorded, to have their fulfilment? *When* was Christ, or the Son of man, to come and sit upon the throne of his glory? *When* were all nations to be gathered before him, and this separation to take place? On a correct answer to these queries does the whole matter depend. Hear then what saith the 'faithful and true witness,' in regard to his own coming: 'For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and *then* he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, *there be some standing here* which shall *not taste of death, till they see the Son man coming* in his kingdom.' Math. xvi. 27, 28. 'And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. * * * * Verily, I say unto you, *this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.*' xxiv. 30–34. 'But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily, I say unto you, ye *shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the Son of man be come.*' Math. x. 23. Of the same purport is Mark viii. 38, and ix. 1; so also, Luke xxi. 20–36, where the judgments of the Almighty are recorded as coming on

Jerusalem and Judea, and the signs of which were to be a sure token to them, that the kingdom of God was 'nigh at hand,' even as they would know that summer was nigh, when the fig tree puts forth its leaves.

Besides, the express language of Christ, in relation to the time of the 'coming of the Son of man,' there is other internal evidence of that coming having reference to the *temporal* judgments hanging over the house of Israel. Those that were in Judea were exhorted to 'flee into the mountains,' and those 'on the house tops not to come down to take any thing out of the house,' at that eventful crisis, and a 'woe' was pronounced upon those that were '*with child*, and them that *gave suck* in those days,' plainly intimating that the things of time, and not of eternity, were then spoken of by our Lord.

This point settled—that the coming of the Son of man was 'before that generation should pass away.' and before some who heard Christ speak, should 'taste of death,' or die, the remaining portions of the parable will admit of easy explanation.

'Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire,' means depart ye condemned into *aionion* fire, or the punishment of *that age*, set forth by the common figure of *fire*. By 'the Devil and his angels,' we understand the 'adversary,' or reigning power which persecuted and opposed the religion of Jesus—and his messengers or vassals who aided and abetted in the unholy work. The wicked going into "everlasting (aionion) punishment,' and the righteous into 'life (aionion) eternal,' proves the *equality of duration* of their respective dooms, both being expressed by the same original word. And *as* Christ limits the phrase everlasting, as applied to life,—'He that believeth *hath* everlasting life,' meaning the life of faith in the Gospel of Christ; *so*, we limit the meaning of the same word, when applied to punishment. Hence the conclusion, that everlasting punishment means nothing more than *age-lasting* punishment, or the punishment of *that age*—a view of the subject confirmed by a reference to the primary meaning of the

Greek term rendered punishment in the 46th verse. This word is *koladzin*, and signifies pruning, correcting, reforming; thus showing, that the punishment inflicted on the Jews was *remedial* in its nature, and entirely different from *endless* suffering without mercy and without purpose of reformation.

SECTION XXVII.

"The Son of man goeth, as it is written of him, but woe unto that man, by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man, if he had not been born." Math. xxvi. 24; Mark, xiv. 21; Luke, xxii. 22.

"Those that thou gavest me, I have kept, and none of them is lost but the son of perdition." John, xvii. 12.

"That he might go to his own place." Acts, i. 25.

It is generally thought, that the endless woe of Judas Iscariot, the betrayer of our Lord to the malignant Jews, is clearly proven by the above passages of Scripture. It is confidently asserted that the *woe* pronounced upon him by Christ, positively implies his utter ruin in the prison-house of hell, inasmuch as that doom is the only one which would justify the expression, "it had been good for that man, if he had never been born." Such a remark, says the objector, could not with propriety have been made, if Judas is to be eternally happy in the presence of God and the Lamb forever. To which we reply, 1st. that the phrase was a proverbial one among the Jews, intended to show how "deplorable was the condition of those persons to whom it was applied, but does not imply the positive impossibility either of their repentance or salvation." So says Dr. Clarke, who quotes many instances of the use of this proverb from Schœtgen. 2d. Language of a similar kind was used by Job and Jeremiah, those servants of the Living God, whom no one supposes to be heirs of perdition. Job cursed the day in which he was born, and wished he had 'died from the womb,' as as 'an untimely birth,' or, 'as infants who never saw light.' Job. iii 1, 6: and Jeremiah cursed the day wherein he was born, and the man who brought tidings of his birth to his father, 'because he slew him not from the womb'—saying also, 'wherefore came I forth out of the womb to see labor and sorrow.' Jer. xx. 14. 18. If the language of Christ, therefore, proves the dam-

nation of Judas, we may infer that Job and Jeremiah are under the same condemnation.

Nor does the phrase 'son of perdition,' as applied to Judas, prove his endless wretchedness, because the language used is in the past and present tenses. 'Those thou gavest me I *have kept*, and none of them *is lost* but the son of perdition.' Here the 'lost' state of Judas is put in contrast with the 'kept' condition of the residue of the disciples. They were already kept, and Judas was then lost, even before he had betrayed his Lord and Master! Of a certainty, therefore, we cannot conclude, that Judas will be eternally lost, because he was 'lost' here upon the earth, for, on the same principle, we should be able to prove the endless perdition of the whole human race. Christ came to 'save that which was lost'; and all who have sinned, are in a *lost* condition. 'All we like sheep have gone astray." &c.

Nor will the appellation of *Devil* to Judas prove that he is the fit companion of fiends of darkness. Christ said to his disciples, 'Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?' This interrogatory, on Calvinistic principles, would prove rather the safety of Judas than his ruin, as it implies that he was one of the *elect*, who cannot, by any possibility, fall away, finally! Nor will the Arminian, who believes in 'falling from grace,' derive any advantage from this remark, unless he is willing to consign Peter, also, to the same awful doom; because, to him Christ said, on one occasion, 'get behind me, Satan'!

Again, it is said that the phrase, 'might go to his own place' proves the perpetual misery of Judas; but Commentators are not agreed, either as to the application of the phrase, or its meaning. Some suppose that it refers to the place vacated by Judas, which Mathias was elected to fill, and that the remark was made concerning the latter. Others think, that 'his own place' means his former place of residence or business, as in Numbers xxiv, 25. where it is said, Balaam 'returned to his place.' Others refer it the grave, simply, to which all were to go, as in Eccl. iii. 20. 'All go unto one place.' Dr. Clarke says, '1st, it remains to be proved that

this place means hell, and 2d, it is not clear, that the words are spoken of Judas, but of Mathias.'

Another reason why Judas is supposed to be suffering endless woe, is the assumed fact that he *committed suicide*. To which we reply, that it is not certain that he did take his own life; and if he did, it is no reason why he should be sent to the regions of endless despair. There are two versions given of the catastrophe which befel Judas. In one place we are told that he 'departed and went and hanged himself,' and in another, that 'falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.' Acts, i. 18. The former phrase might be better rendered *suffocated* or *choked*, and Mr. Wakefield supposes that Judas was suffocated or choked with grief or anguish. But admitting that he did take his own life, what then? Would you punish an idiot, an infant, or a madman, for any act they might commit? Certainly not. No more would it be just to punish a man, in eternity, for taking his own life, simply because it is the act of one, who has, for the time being, lost his reason. No one of sound mind would commit suicide, as 'no man ever hated his own flesh.'

But, the salvation of Judas can be made certain, even on strictly 'orthodox' grounds. He had time and space for *repentance*, and he improved the same. He openly confessed, that he had 'betrayed innocent blood;' brought back the money and cast it down at the feet of the Jews—thus affording the best evidence of the sincerity of his repentance. Now, all partialists admit that a death-bed repentance is sufficient, and many a base wretch is sent, from the dungeon's gloom to heaven's glory, by the ministers of the day, on no better grounds than are found in the history of Judas.

Besides, we read that the "the scripture must needs be fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake concerning Judas," and Peter says, that it was by the *determinate counsel and foreknowledge* of God, that Jesus was delivered up, and 'by wicked hands crucified and slain.' Acts, ii. 23. In view of these facts, how can it be supposed

that Judas is suffering endless perdition? He was the instrument in the hands of God, to do his will, and to fulfil the Scriptures. He was chosen for this particular purpose, and completed his work, in accordance with the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of Deity! Could he then have avoided his destiny? Could he have chosen, *not* to have been the betrayer of his Lord? God knew the *end*, and appointed the *means*,—and seeing Judas was the agent in the transaction, in obedience to the sovereign will of the Almighty, shall he be sent to an an endless hell, because he accomplished the task assigned him? God forbid! Yet, on precisely such grounds are myriads of the human family hastening on in the broad road, to irremediable ruin. All who believe in the dogma of endless woe, must either deny the attributes of Jehovah, or allow that such a doom is prepared for man, by the 'determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God,' just as much as Judas was so bound, to act his part in the tragical scene, on the brow of Calvary! If any, therefore, insist upon the eternal damnation of Judas, the instrument of their own eternal salvation, through Christ, (for, had Christ not died and rose again, the Christian's hope is vain,) let them honestly contend for unconditional *election* and *reprobation;* for verily, these somewhat antiquated dogmas are the only legitimate conclusions from such God-dishonoring and unmerciful premises.

SECTION XXVIII.

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be *damned*." Mark xvi. 15. 16.

The Greek word *katakrino*, from which the word translated *damned*, in the text, is derived, corresponds, says the Presbyterian Dr. Campbell, with the English word *condemn*. The Dr. further says, that the word damned is not a true version of the Greek word. Dr. Horne translates the text as follows: 'He that believeth not shall be condemned, or accountable for his sins,' and Cappe declares that the salvation, here spoken of, is not the salvation of a future life, but exemption and preservation from the wrath to come upon a large part of that

present generation of the Jewish people, for their unbelief.

We object to the popular interpretation of this text, for several reasons:

1. It is inconsistent with the teachings of the schools, as to the ground of future rewards and punishments. Much the largest portion of the Christian world, now preach up *good works*, as the only way of acceptance and reward in heaven, but here it is *faith* which seems to be necessary to secure salvation. The text is used, however, as often by the Arminians as by Calvinists, in proof of the endless damnation of the unbeliever! so hard are they pushed for proof of their darling doctrine.

2. Were we to admit the idea, that unless a man believes the gospel of Christ, in this life, he shall be *damned to all eternity*, and that this is proved by the text, then we should have to allow of the perdition of all the *heathen*, of all *infants* dying in infancy, of all idiots and lunatics, and of all those who have not had sufficient testimony to convince their minds of the truth of Christianity! *Faith*, it will be recollected is the *test*. 'Believe, or be damned,' is the word, from the obligations of which there is no escape. How then shall the heathen believe on him, of whom they have never heard? How can the prattling babe have *faith* in the Son of God? Or, how can that hapless class of the human family—the idiotic—whom God, in his inscrutable wisdom, has deprived of reason—'heaven's best gift to man,'—have faith in the Redeemer? It is impossible! and *God knew this impossibility* when he created man and placed him in Egyptian darkness, or removed far from him the means of coming at the knowledge of the truth!

Disguise the matter then, as you may, the truth is palpable, that the doctrines of *heathen* and '*infant damnation*,' are advocated by *every* one who quotes this or any other text in proof of the position, that *faith* in the gospel of Christ, here upon the earth, is necessary for the eternal well-being of man!

3. The popular interpretation makes the *faith* of man depend entirely upon *his will*, without regard to the nature and

force of evidence, or the capacity to understand moral truth than which a more fallacious idea never entered into the mind of rational beings.

4. The common interpretation of the text will prove *universal damnation.* Every believer has given to him, in the context, a criterion or standard, by which to know whether his faith is spurious or genuine, as follows: 'And these signs *shall follow them that believe:* in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover.' Let those then who bring forward this text in proof of the *endless damnation* of the unbeliever, produce the evidence that they themselves are genuine Christians! Can you, Mr. Calvinist, perform the 'signs and wonders' here spoken of? Can *you,* ye disciples of Arminius? Has any one, preacher or layman, man or woman, since the days of miracles, been able to come up to the standard here laid down? Verily, there are none! No one, since that day, has passed through the ordeal of faith, thus established by the Master himself, and passed triumphantly. All are therefore in the same condemnation. All are unbelievers still, and all *shall be damned* eternally, if popular theology be 'the truth as it is in Jesus!'

By limiting, however, the commission of Christ to those whom he addressed, and understanding the word *damned* as expressive of the present condemnation which ever attends those who are unbelievers, as in John iii. 18. 'He that believeth not, *is condemned* (or damned) *already,*' the intelligent reader will find nothing in the text under consideration, which militates, in the least, against the final holiness and happiness of the whole family of man.

SECTION XXIX.

"Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.' Luke xiii. 3, 5.

This passage is supposed by some to prove, that those who do not repent of their sins in this life, shall perish forever in hell. But there is about as much sense in this interpretation,

as in that of the old dame, who supposed it taught the alarming denunciation 'except ye *pay rent* ye shall all be turned out of the *parish!*' No one who has ever examined the context of the passage can be so blind to its true meaning. Two instances of retribution were spoken of by Christ, that which befel the Galileans 'whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices,' and that which happened to the eighteen 'on whom the tower of Siloam fell.' 'Suppose ye, (says Christ) that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things, I tell you, nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all *likewise* perish. Or those eighteen, on whom the tower of Siloam fell and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you nay: but except ye repent, ye shall all *likewise* perish.' How did these men perish? They suffered a temporal death—and in like manner, or 'likewise' would others perish, unless they repented of their wickedness. But what resemblance there is between being crushed to death under a falling tower and being drowned in the molten sea of an endless hell, it would puzzle a wiser head than ours to determine. Yet all this and more, is perfectly clear to many of those who set themselves up as teachers in Israel, in this our day! To the spiritual vision of such, nothing is obscure, which will serve the purpose of hoodwinking the people, and keeping them in the bondage of fear, which 'hath torment.'

SECTION XXX.

"Cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?" Luke, xiii. 7.

This language of Christ, concerning the 'barren fig-tree,' is sometimes quoted by the preachers of terror, on funeral and such like occasions, in proof of the danger of sinning away the day of grace, and the dreadful consequences of being cut off suddenly from the earth, because of the misimprovement of privileges. But this application will be seen to be a forced one, on reference to the like phraseology in Math. iii. 10. where Christ said, "and *now*, also, the axe is laid at the root of the of the trees, therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." Dr. Clarke interprets this last in a temporal sense.

SECTION XXXI.

"There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day And there was a certain beggar, named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich mans's table: moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame." &c Luke, xvi. 19-31.

This passage may be considered one of the 'strong holds' of modern 'orthodoxy,' inasmuch as it is generally quoted in proof of the future misery of *one* individual, and, by inference, of all others of like character and conduct. In the fate of the 'Rich Man,' do we find positive evidence, it is thought, of the existence of a place of torment called *Hell*, into which men are to be cast, *after they are dead!* And this idea is based chiefly on the supposition, that the account here given us of Dives and Lazarus is a *literal history of facts* or narration of *actual events* which have transpired, and *not* a *parable* or *figure*, illustrative of some particular truth in relation to the moral condition of men, and the dealings of Providence with them.

To the notion thus generally entertained, that this account is to be understood *literally*, there are many insurmountable objections. We would then have to allow, that Lazarus was carried, with all his putridity and corruption, and deposited in the bosom of the patriarch Abraham, who had himself been dead some hundreds of years, and that this was done by angels, before the beggar was buried! We should also be obliged to admit that the 'rich man' was buried 'in hell,' and that he thence lifted up his eyes, though dead and buried, and through the aid of these *bodily* organs saw 'afar off' the 'Father of the faithful,'—that he was actually the *son* of Abraham, for he called him 'Father,'—that *hell* and 'Abraham's bosom' were so near as to be within speaking dis-

tance,—that he had a *tongue*, also, which he believed could be cooled by a drop of water, from the tip of the finger of Lazarus, and that he wished this dead beggar to be sent to him for that purpose !—And, furthermore, we should have to allow that the 'rich man' was tormented, *because* he received good things in his life-time, and that Lazarus was comforted in Abraham's bosom, *because* he was a poor beggar on the earth,(an awful warning to the *rich* Christians of this day;) —that there was a disposition in those with Abraham to go where Dives was, and vice versa, to prevent which, a great gulf was placed between—thus elevating hell on one side and Abraham's bosom on the other, and showing that the gulf and 'hell' are not one and the same place ;—and finally, we should have to admit that in the regions of the damned there are truly benevolent beings, who even offer prayers to Abraham, not to God, in behalf of their brethren, lest they also should come to the same place of torment!

Now, every one can see that such an interpretation would make nonsense of the inspired writings, and in truth, no one understands the whole account *literally*, as is evident from the *figurative* meaning given to the phrase 'Abraham's bosom,' and the *gratuitous* assumptions, not warranted by the text, that the 'immortal souls' of Dives and Lazarus are spoken of, and that their respective situations in eternity corresponded to the good and bad moral characters they sustained in life, when the fact is, that not a word is said on the subject.

We will now attempt a brief explanation of the *parable*, premising simply, that in our opinion, its principal object appears to have been, to set forth the great change which was about to take place in the relative situation of the Jewish and Gentile people, by the overthrow of the former—a nation long peculiarly favored of God, and the introduction of the latter into the privileges which the Jews rejected against themselves.

Verse 19. '*There was a certain rich man.*'—The house of Israel is thus personified: 'Jacob is the lot of his inheritance,' and the 'Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange God with him. He made him ride on the high pla-

ces of the earth, that he might eat the increase of the fields, and he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock;' &c. Deut. xxxii. 9–14. They were 'Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.' Rom. ix. 4.

'*Which was clothed in purple and fine linen.*'—So was Jerusalem represented in Ez. xvi. 10, 14. 'I clothed thee also with bordered work and shod thee with badger's skin, and I girded the about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk, I decked thee also with ornaments.' * * * * 'and thy raiment was of fine linen and silk,' &c. So also were the holy garments of the Priesthood made 'of blue and purple and scarlet,' and the ephod 'of gold and blue and purple and scarlet and fine twined linen.' Ex. xxxix. 1–2.

'*There was a certain beggar.*'—This represents the Gentile people, who were the 'publicans and sinners,' of that day. They were looked upon as 'dogs,' without the gate of the temple, and were not admitted to any of the privileges of worship therein. They were 'aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.' Eph. ii. 12.

'*The beggar died and was carried by angels into Abrahaham's bosom.*'—The Gentile world died to heathenism and sin, and were at length made partakers of the enjoyments of the gospel. They died to their idolatry and wickedness, and were brought by the apostles, angels or messengers of the Church, into the privileges of the 'new and better covenant, founded upon better promises,' first given to Abraham. Into the bosom of this covenant, which contained blessings for all people, were the Gentiles introduced. 'It was necessary (said Paul and Barnabas to the Jews,) that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo we turn to the Gentiles.' Acts xiii. 46.

'*The rich man also died and was buried.*—The Jews died a political and ecclesiastical death. The priesthood was e-

bolished and their purple and fine linen taken from them. Their temple and rituals were overthrown, and they became a scattered people, even to this day. They died, moreover, to the light and went into darkness—the darkness of unbelief and superstition, which will hang as a veil over their minds, 'until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in.'

'*In hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment.*'—This is the same *hell* which Christ declared (Math. xi. 22,) Capernaum should be brought down unto—*Hades*—and the same into which David was cast, when he found trouble and sorrow, and also the same in which Christ was, and which is to be destroyed, according to the prediction of the prophet Hosea. Here we suppose it means the state of desolation and ruin, in which the unbelieving Jews would find themselves, on the 'coming of the Son of man,' in power and great glory, and perhaps, likewise, to the jealousy and envy with which they burned against the Gentiles, on seeing them 'come from the east and west and north and south, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven,' and finding themselves 'the children of the kingdom, cast out into utter darkness, where shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.' Math. viii. 11, 12.

This view of the subject is confirmed by the remainder of the parable. The rich man called Abraham 'Father,' and Abraham acknowledged the relationship, by calling him 'Son.' So said the Jews: 'We have Abraham to our Father.' Math. iii. 9. There was a 'great gulf fixed.' Perhaps this refers to the blindness of unbelief which happened to Israel, and which effectually prevents those who adhere to the law from participating in the blessings of the gospel. The rich man wanted more evidence to be sent to his brethren, who had not yet been involved in the same trouble, but Abraham refers them to 'Moses and the Prophets,' which they, and they only, had in their possession, for all necessary proof in the case. Now, 'Moses and the Prophets' say *nothing* respecting a future state, but a great deal concerning the calamities coming upon Jerusalem and Judea! And on further entreaty of Dives, Abraham told him that if they be-

lieved not the evidence in their hands they would not believe, 'though one rose from the dead.' And so it came to pass literally. A real Lazarus was afterwards raised from the dead Yet did not the Jews believe in the promised Messiah!

Enough has perhaps been said on this subject, but as it is a point much insisted on, that the parable proves an endless hell, we subjoin the sentiments of some standard commentators of the *partialist* School of Theology, in confirmation of the view we have presented.

Says LIGHTFOOT—'Whoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the 'rich glutton' stood!'——'The main scope and design of it seems this—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the Prophets, did not believe them.'

DR. WHITBY remarks: 'that this is only a parable and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident; 1, because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonicum*, where it is cited by Mr. Sheringham in the preface to his Joma; 2, from the circumstances of it, viz: the rich man's lifting up his eyes in hell, and seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom; his discourse with Abraham; his complaint of being tormented with flames, and his desire that Lazarus might be sent to cool his tongue; and if all this be confessedly *parable*, why should the rest, which is the very parable in the Gemara, be accounted history?'

WAKEFIELD says, 'It must be remembered that *hades* no where means hell—*gehenna*—in any author whatsoever, sacred or profane, and also, that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable, Math. xiii 34, and not a piece of real history. To them who regard the narration as a reality, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the purgatory of the Papists. The universal meaning of hades is the *state of death*.' &c.

DR. GILL gives a double interpretation to the parable—one view, as follows: '*The rich man died*. It may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jew.

ish people, which lay in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem and of the temple, and in the abolition of the temple-worship and of the whole ceremonial law,' &c. And on the phrase, 'in hell—in torment,' he remarks—'This may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews, at the destruction of Jerusalem, when a fire was kindled against their land and burned to the lowest hell, and consumed the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains, and the whole land became brimstone, salt and burning.' Deut. xxix. 23, 27, 28; xxxii. 22.

In conclusion, we would refer the reader to a similar illustration of the parable, as found in the writings of JAMES BATE, A. M. an English clergyman, who, we have no reason to suppose, was a Universalist. See note.*

* "We will suppose, then, the rich man, who fared so sumptuously, to be the Jew, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. The poor beggar who lay at his gate, in so miserable a plight, was the poor Gentile, now reduced to the last degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge. The crumbs which fell from the rich man's table, and which the beggar wbs so desirous of picking up, were such fragments of patrarchal and Jewish traditions, as their travelling philosophers were able to pick up, with their utmost care and diligence. And those philosophers were also the dogs that licked the sores of heathenism, and endeavored to supply the wants of divine revelation, by such schemes and hypotheses, concerning the nature of the gods, and the obligation of moral duties, as, due allowance for their ignorance and frailties, did no small honor to human nature, and yet thereby plainly showed, how little a way unassisted reason could go, without some supernatural help, as one of the wisest of them frankly confessed. About one and the same time, the beggar dies and is carried by the angels, i. e. God's spiritual messengers to mankind, into Abraham's bosom; that is, he is engrafted into the church of God. And the rich man also dies and is buried. He dies what we call a political death. His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar son of God. The people whom he parabolically represents, are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype. for a like crime; and which mark may perhaps be their adherence to the law. Whereby it came amazingly to pass, that these people, though dispersed, yet still dwell alone and separate, not being reckoned among the nations,

SECTION XXXII.

"Jesus answerd and said unto him, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."—John iii. 3.

This text is often quoted in proof of the necessity of a radical change of nature, in order to fit for the kingdom of glory in another world. But on examination, we will find that the phrase 'Kingdom of God' has seldom, if ever, any reference to any thing more than the gospel dispensation set up by Christ here upon the earth. So, in the opinion of Whitby, Campbell, Pearce, Lightfoot, Hammond, Gilpin and other Commentators of celebrity. In proof of the limited meaning of the phrases 'kingdom of heaven,' and 'kingdom of God,' refer to Luke xvii. 20-21. where Christ says 'the kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say lo here! or lo there! for behold the kingdom of God *is within you.*' Again, we read that the 'kingdom of God is not meat and drink: but righteousness and peace and

as Balaam foretold. The rich man being reduced to this state of misery, complains bitterly of his hard fate, but is told by Abraham, that he slipped his opportunity, while Lazarus laid hold on his, and now receives the comfort of it. The Jew complains of his want of more evidence, to convince his countrymen, the five brethren, and would fain have Lazarus sent from the dead to convert them. But Abraham tells him, that if their own scriptures cannot convince them of their error, neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead: And exactly so it proved in the event. For this parable was delivered towards the end of the third year of our Lords' ministry; and in the fourth or following year of it, the words put into the mouth of Abraham, as the conclusion of the parable, are most literally verified, by our Lord raising anothe Lazarus from the dead. And we may presume, that the beggar had the fictitious name of Lazarus given him in the parable, not without some reason, since the supposed request of the rich man was fully answered, by our Lord's raising another, and a real Lazarus from the dead. But what was the consequence? Did this notorious miracle convince the rich man's brethren? No, truly. His visit to them from the dead was so far from convincing them that they actually consulted together, that they might put Lazarus also to death; because that, by reason of him, many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus. So much for the true sense of this parable."

joy in the holy ghost.' Rom. xiv. 17. 'For the kingdom of God is not in word but in power.' 1 Cor. iv. 20. 'Seek first the kingdom.' Math. vi. 33. 'Thou art not far from the kingdom.' Mark xii. 34. 'Repent, for the kingdom of heaven *is at hand*.' Math. iii. 2. Joseph of Arimathea 'waited for the kingdom.' Mark xv. 43. 'I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also.' Luke iv. 43. 'The kingdom of God *is come* unto you.' Math. xii. 28. 'The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.' Math. xxi: 43. Let these examples suffice.

By being 'born again,' (or from above) Christ meant, we presume, only to express the necessity of a change of the views and feelings of Nicodemus and such like, before they could be qualified to enter upon the practise of his self-denying religion. This was a proverbial phrase, moreover, among the Jews, and was applied by them to those who renounced Paganism and embraced Judaism. Such were said to be like 'a child new born.' Christ seems to have used the phrase in its usual acceptation—to signify that even the self-righteous Jews who imagined themselves already sufficiently righteous, must be baptised into the spirit of his doctrine, and be cleansed from the dross of sin, before they could become teachable disciples in his gospel kingdom. No Pharisee could thus gain admittance because his views were partial and his notions bigoted. Christ's religion, on the contrary, was general in its provisions of blessings, and presented all mankind as the heirs of the impartial favor of the Universal Parent. His religion was love and love universal, and those who were introduced into its spirit were already 'born of God,' for says St. John, '*He that* LOVETH *is born of God*.' The want of understanding on the part of Nicodemus may be referred to his astonishment at the requisition Christ made of *him*—a Ruler among the Jews—to be 'born again,' rather than to his ignorance of this proverbial phrase among his people. More anon, when we come to speak of conversion and the new birth, in a succeeding chapter.

SECTION XXXIII.

"Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."– John. v. 28, 29."

By a reference to the context we will discover that our Lord was not here speaking of the literal resurrection of the dead, but of a moral revolution which was then nigh at hand. Christ had just cured the 'impotent man' at the pool of Bethesda, on the Sabbath day, wherefore the Jews sought to kill him. He seeing their malice, attributed the power he possessed to the Father who sent him, and declared that the Son could do nothing of himself—'for as the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.' Here was an allusion to the temporal cure just performed. Christ then proceeds in verse 24, to speak of the life of faith in the gospel and its saving efficacy. 'Verily I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on him that sent me, *hath everlasting life*, and shall not come into *condemnation*, (*eis krisin*) but *is passed* from death unto life.' Of course, the meaning so far is plain. The everlasting life was *then* enjoyed, and the believer had already passed from death unto life. It was therefore a moral or spiritual death here spoken of as the opposite of 'everlasting life.' Christ then adds in the 25th verse. 'Verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, *and now is*, when the *dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have live in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment, (*krisin*) also, because he is the Son of man.' (26-27.) Then follows the text, without any intimation whatever that Christ had changed the subject of his discourse, as given in the 24th and 25th verses, wherein he defines the time of the dead hearing the voice of the Son of God, as '*coming* and NOW IS.' It will be seen also, that the same Greek word rendered damnation in the 29th verse is rendered condemnation in the 24th and judgment in the 27th.

The truth is, that our Lord was only quoting, in this discourse, the language of the Prophet Daniel, as given us in the 12th chapter of that prophecy, 2d verse: 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' In the preceding verse the Prophet defines the time of this to be, when Michael, the Great Prince (Christ) should stand up, and there should be 'a time of trouble such as was not since there was a nation, even to that same time.' And this identical language of Daniel was quoted by Christ in Math. xxiv. 15, 21, when speaking of the judgments of God coming upon the rebellious Jews! How then can we understand him in the text to speak of an entirely different transaction?

In confirmation of what has just been advanced, let the reader turn to Ezekiel, xxxvii. and read the prophetic account of the valley of vision—concerning the 'dry bones' upon which sinews and flesh came, and into which breath was infused, by the command of the Almighty—the whole representing the coming up of the Israelites 'out of their *graves*' of bondage in Babylon, into their own land. Here was a political or national *resurrection*, and it is plain proof that there are various *resurrections* spoken of in the scriptures. So also of the word *death*, &c. It is used figuratively in many places, as in Math. iv. 16, where it is said that the people 'sat in darkness' and 'in the region and shadow of death.' Of the same purport is Luke i. 78, and the Apostle uses like language in Eph. ii. 1. 'And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins.' So that no reliance can be placed upon such expressions to prove the doctrine drawn from the text, that there will be a resurrection of the body to eternal damnation. In every place too, where the general resurrection is spoken of, we will find that a great and glorious change is thereby to be brought about—a change from corruption, sin and mortality, to incorruption, immortality and glory—equal to that which is enjoyed by angels and seraphs in the presence of God. And, in not a solitary instance, is *this resurrection* connected with pain or condemnation as its consequence.

SECTION XXXIV.

"Ye shall seek me and shall not find me; and whither I am, thither ye cannot come." John. vii. 34. "Then said John again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in yor sins: whither I go ye cannot come" viii. 21.

This language is frequently paraphrased or quoted thus by the ignorant and unlearned, as well as by the more enlightened clergy :—'*If* ye die in your sins, where God and his Christ is, ye never can come.' Three Methodist preachers of Georgia, two or three years since, clubbed their wits together to puzzle the writer, and this text was the result of their labors; but as they omitted the chapter and verse where it was to be found, we deferred an explanation until they could have time to point it out. ☞ That time has not yet arrived!

It is a sufficient reason in proof that the passages at the head of this section do not teach the doctrine of endless woe, that Christ addressed the same language to his own disciples in John xiii. 33: "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me, and as I said unto the Jews, whither I go, ye connot come, so now I say to you.' According to Gilpin and others, the text is 'no more than a general declaration' concerning the departure of Christ, but Calmet thinks it may have the same meaning as Luke xvii. 22: 'the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the son of man, and ye shall not see it.' A desire equally entertained by the Christian and the unbeliever in the persecutions and distress coming upon the land.

SECTION XXXV.

"For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." Rom. xiv. 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2d Cor. v. 10.

The verse succeeding that first quoted will show its meaning. 'For it is written, as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.' And by omitting the words in the second quotation which have been supplied by the translators, we shall learn its sig-

nification to be entirely different from that usually drawn from it:—'For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things IN BODY, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad;' that is, *in life*, for if a man receives his punishment '*in body*,' he cannot receive it *in spirit*, and in eternity!

SECTION XXXVI.

"Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, &c. &c. shall inherit the Kingdom of God." 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 19-21; Eph. v. 5.

The remarks concerning the phrase 'Kingdom of God,' in section xxxii. will apply with equal force here; but if this were not the case, and it can be proved that the kingdom of glory is meant in these passages, they will not disprove the doctrine of universal blessedness, inasmuch as it is an essential part of our faith, that *holiness* is necessary to prepare the human race for the joys of heaven. It never was contended that any such characters, as above described, would enter the gates of the New Jerusalem above, in their sinful condition. Besides, the Apostle Paul declares that such were some of the Corinthian brethren—'but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified,' &c., that is:—though once adulterers, idolators, &c. they are no longer so, but are members of that kingdom from which they were excluded, while in the practise of sinful courses.

SECTION XXXVII.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." 2d Thes. i. 6-10.

Taking this passage in a literal sense, and it will prove the *annihilation* of the persons thus punished. To understand the phrase 'everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord,' as synonimous with endless banishment to the prison-house of hell, would imply that God is *not omniscient!* But David thought differently. Says he, 'whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there! If I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost

parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand sustain me.' Ps. cxxxix. 7-10. What then is the import of the passage? By reference to verses 6 and 7 of this chapter, we will discover that the believers at Thessalonica were troubled, and that they had not only the assurance, that God would recompense tribulation to their persecutors, but that they should have a period of 'rest.' Who those persecutors were may be learned from 1 Thes. ii. 14, 15. They were the 'countrymen' of the Thessalonians, urged on by the unbelieving Jews, as will more fully appear from Acts xvii. 1, 5, 7. And what it was to be banished from *the presence* of the Lord, may be inferred from the fact that "Jerusalem and the Temple were considered the special residence of the most High. There the symbols of the divine glory were placed, and God is said to dwell between the cherubim. Ps. lxxx. 1. The loaves or show bread placed in the temple were called the 'loaves of *the presence* or faces.' Viewed in this light, there is a peculiar beauty and force in the following, among other passages that might be quoted: 'Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving'; 'Serve the Lord with gladness, come before his presence with singing. Glory and honor are in his presence; strength and gladness are in his place.' Ps. xcv. 2—c. 2; 1 Chron. xvi. 27. That the land of Judea, and particularly the temple, were looked on as the place of God's presence, is further evident. Thus it is said in Jonah i. 3. 'But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord.' (See also verse 10.) Where Jonah believed the presence of the Lord to be, we learn, chapt. ii. 4, when he said, 'I am cast out of thy sight; but I will look again toward thy holy temple."*

The *time when* this banishment was to take place is stated in the 7th verse—'When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance,' &c. Compare this with Luke xvii. 30, and this last with its context, where Christ was speaking of the com.

*Rev. Mr. Balfour's Sermon on the text.

ing of the son of man. See also Math. xxiv. 30, 31-34, on the same point. 'Taking vengeance' has the same signification as in Luke xxi. 22. 'For these be the days of vengeance,' which language was spoken in reference to the *temporal judgments* coming upon the rebellious Jews. The word '*everlasting*' in the text is *aionion*, which has already been fully explained.

SECTION XXXVIII.

"And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might damned who believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.

In the commencement of this chapter the Apostle exhorts his brethren not to be 'shaken in mind,' nor 'be troubled neither by spirit nor by word,' 'as that the day of Christ *is at hand*.' He then informs them that this day should not arrive, until there be a 'falling away first and that man of sin be revealed—the son of perdition.' Dr. Hammond supposes that Simon Magus, the head of the Gnostic sect, is here spoken of, all of whom were involved in the destruction of the unbelieving Jews. Dr. Whitby supposes the apostacy of the Jewish nation is here indicated, and Dr. M'Night finds in the language of the apostle a reference to the '*little horn*,' and 'blasphemous king,' of the prophet Daniel, which he supposes are identical with the 'man of sin,' and 'son of perdition,' or the *lawless one*. But none of them refer the passage to the future state or the retributions of eternity.

SECTION XXXIX.

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away to renew them again unto repentance." Heb. vi. 4, 6.

The *impossibility* here spoken of must be understood in a limited sense—as a thing very difficult. As St. Gregory Nazianzen observes, there are 'five senses in which a thing is ordinarily said to be impossible—one thing is impossible from its nature, another from custom, a third from equity and justice, a fourth from the state of the will, a fifth is absolute-

ly and really impossible.' In the case before us, we suppose the *impossibility* is that of the will of man, not of God, for with God 'all things are possible.' The apostle designed to set forth the *extreme difficulty* of bringing back to the enjoyments of the Christian life, those who had once been enlightened, and who had 'tasted the good word of God,' inasmuch, as they had already received all the testimony the nature of the subject would afford. Calmet says, that 'St. Paul by no means intended to exclude the baptism of tears and of repentance, for the expiation of those sins which we commit after regeneration.' And Dr. M'Night remarks that the 'apostle does not mean that it is impossible for God to renew a second time, by repentance, but that it is impossible for the ministers of Christ to convert a second time to the faith of the gospel, one, who after being made acquainted with all the proofs by which God had thought fit to establish Christ's mission, shall allow himself to think him an impostor and renounce his gospel.'* Dr. Clarke in noticing the phrase, 'nigh unto cursing, whose end is to be burned,' refers it to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. 'Thus, (says he) the apostle, under the case of individuals, points out the destruction that was to come upon this people in general, and which actually took place about seven years after writing this epistle. And this appears to be the very subject which the apostle has in view in the parallel solemn passages, chapter x. 26–31, and viewed in this light, much of their obscurity and difficulty vanishes away.'

SECTION XL.

"And *as* it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this, the judgment: *so* Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. ix. 27, 28.

This text is most generally quoted as follows: 'It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment,' and, in this mutilated form, it is pressed into the support of the

* For these and other quotations from Commentators of acknowledged standing in limitarian churches, we are indebted to a valuable work by Rev. L. R. Paige, of Cambridgeport, Mass. entitled 'Selections from eminent Commentators.'

dogma of a *general judgment day* in eternity. On examination of the context, however, it will be seen that the apostle was contrasting the *legal* dispensation with that of the *gospel*, as evinced by the copulatives '*as*,' and '*so*,' in the text. Throughout the 9th chapter and beginning of the 10th, he argues the imperfection of the sacrifices and offerings under the law to make the comers thereunto perfect, and alleges that the services of the first covenant, with its first and second tabernacles, into which last the High Priest went alone once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and the errors of the people. (verse 7.) all of which was only prefigurative of the one great offering of Christ, the great High Priest, who did not enter 'into the holy places made with hands, but into heaven itself,' and for whom it was not necessary to 'offer himself often, as the High Priest (under the law) entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others,'——'but now *once* in the end of the world, (age.) hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.' Then comes the text, which, by the copulatives 'as,' and 'so,' clearly proves the comparison continued, to point out the difference between the *figurative* death offered by the Jewish High Priest, when clothed with the *breast plate of judgment*, and the actual death of Christ and his appearing a 'second time without sin unto salvation.' See Exodus xxviii. 29, 30. But if it is still contended that this text has reference to the death of mankind generally, and a judgment after, it will not prove the doctrine of endless suffering, as Christ was to appear unto *salvation* and not unto *damnation*.

SECTION XLI.

"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to *hell* and delivered them unto chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." 2 Peter. ii. 4.

The word translated *hell*, in this text, is neither *gehenna* nor *hades*, but *tartaros*, and this is the only place where the word occurs. And admitting the *partialist's* view of the matter, we have nothing to do with it—as 'angels,' and not men, were to be the subjects of the punishment threatened. See exposition of the word Tartaros, page 73.

SECTION XLII.

"Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."—Jude. 7.

A parallel passage to this is 2 Peter ii. 6, on which we remark, that there is a difference between 'suffering the vengeance of eternal (*aionion*) fire,' and suffering fire eternally or endlessly. It will be observed also, that the destruction here spoken of was that which came upon the *cities* of Sodom and Gomorrah, not upon individuals, and this destruction was 'set forth an example,' or, as St. Peter hath it, was made an 'ensample.' Now, it will be evident that the punishment of an endless hell could not here have been meant, because this never can be 'set forth as an example' to deter others who live ungodly. BENSON remarks, 'By their suffering the punishment of eternal fire, St. Jude did *not* mean that those wicked persons were then, and would be always, burning in hell fire. For he intimates, that what they suffered was set forth to public view, and appeared to all, as an example (or specimen) of God's displeasure against vice. That fire which consumed Sodom, &c. might well be called *eternal*, as it burned till it had utterly consumed them, beyond the possibility of their ever being inhabited or rebuilt.'

SECTION XLIII.

"And said unto the mountains and rocks, fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the lamb." Rev. vi. 16.

This passage is found in the account of the opening of the 6th seal, when the 'sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, and the heavens departed as a scroll,' &c. The same phraseology is used by the prophet Isaiah, in describing the 'day of the Lord's vengeance' coming 'upon Idumea and upon the people of his curse to judgment.' And in Math. xxiv. 29. 30, we have a repetition of the same in reference to the 'coming of the Son of man' before that generation should pass from the earth. (verse 34.) See also 2

Peter iii. 10, where the same language is used in reference to the coming of the 'day of the Lord,' and the consequent establishment of 'new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.' Dr. Clarke on the text says, 'All these things may literally apply to the final destruction of Jerusalem, and to the revolution which took place in the Roman Empire, under Constantine the great. Some apply them to the day of Judgment, but they do not seem to have that awful event in view.' *Hammond* and *Lightfoot* concur in opinion that the destruction of the Jewish state was predicted in the highly metaphorical language of the text.

SECTION XLIV.

"And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever: and they have no rest, day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name." Rev. xiv. 9, 11.

The phrase 'day nor night,' in the above, would imply that the retributions spoken of were temporal in their character, as the successive periods of light and darkness, caused by the revolution of the earth on its axis, cannot exist when 'time shall be no longer,' or when the globe is destroyed. And we have before seen that the figure of 'fire and brimstone,' whose 'smoke ascendeth forever,' is a common mode of expression in the Jewish Prophets, expressive of temporal judgments. See Isaiah xxxiv. 9, 10.

SECTION XLV.

"But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Rev. xxi. 8.

In the preceeding chapter, 13th and 14th verses, it is recorded that 'death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them,' and 'death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.' From which it would appear that the 'lake of fire and brimstone' is one thing, and 'hell' another, for the latter was to be cast into the former, which could not be, if the popular opinion be true that they are one and the same place, viz. the home of the damned!

As to the meaning of the phrase 'second death' there is a

diversity of opinion, but the major part of the learned, we believe, interpret it to refer to the apostacy of the Christian church. A *second* death implies a *first*—that first was the 'death passed on all men, for that all have sinned.'—a moral death, or a 'death in trespasses and sins.' By being delivered from that, is to have part in the first resurrection to life everlasting or life of faith in the gospel of Christ. And when those who have once been 'enlightened and tasted the good word of God,' fall back to the beggarly elements of the world, they suffer this 'second death.' Jude speaks of some who were '*twice dead*, plucked up by the roots.' Others explain these deaths to refer to the first and second destructions of the temple, and the overthrow of the Jewish polity and system of worship. Whatever may be the true meaning of the phrase, one thing is very certain, that it has no reference to the things of eternity, and though there may be a thousand deaths, yet death, the *last* enemy is to be destroyed, and mortality swallowed up of life. The phrase 'eternal death' being one of pulpit manufacture, and not of scripture origin, is not worthy of special consideration.

SECTION XLVI.

"He that is unjust let him be unjust still, and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still, and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still, and he that is holy, let him be holy still." Rev. xxii 11.

This passage is sometimes wrested from its connexion, to prove the immutability of the final doom of man. But in the immediate context, we find that the time 'was at hand,' and 'behold I come quickly,' when that which was unjust should so remain. Indeed, there is much internal evidence in the book of Revelations, that all the events spoken of therein, related to persons and things upon the earth. It purports, in the outset, to be a Revelation of Jesus Christ to 'show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass'; and much the larger part of the book is acknowledged by Commentators, to be of local application. Taking into view, also, the fact, that it was written, according to respectable chronological authority, *before* the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and many of its tropes and figures, and much of its extrava-

gant imagery will be more readily understood. That any portion of it is prophetical of events now taking place on the earth, we cannot believe, much less can we join in the opinion that there is the least allusion, in the whole book, to the untried scenes of a future and eternal world.

Reader, this chapter is at an end. It is longer than we intended, but not long enough to give as full an exposition of many passages, as we could have desired: nevertheless, it may be of some service in leading the blind by a way they knew not,' out of the labyrinth of spiritual error, into the liberty of the gospel of Christ. So mote it be. Amen.

CHAPTER IV.

Popular Objections to the Doctrine of Universal Salvation considered and refuted.

So common has it been for the doctrine of God's impartial Love to be misrepresented by its opponents, that the advocate thereof by no means finds his task completed, when he removes all the objections usually brought against his faith, from the scriptures of Truth. It is not a rare circumstance to meet with individuals, who, when driven from all the positions taken from the Bible in favor of the blasphemous notion of the perpetual existence of sin and suffering, in the empire of God, take refuge behind some *cant saying*, or some frivolous objection, manufactured for the occasion, by the spiritual craftsmen of the day! It thus becomes necessary that we pay some attention to those things, which are really unworthy of the least notice, save in view of the influence they may have upon the minds of the unreflecting and the uninformed. To this object therefore—the refutation of popular objections—will this chapter be devoted, in the humble hope that the sincere inquirer after truth may have all stumbling-

blocks removed out of his path, and that the scoffer and the slanderer may discover their transgressions and 'go and sin no more.'

OBJECTION I. "IT IS A NEW DOCTRINE."—It is alledged that Universalism, as a system of religious belief, has only been in existence some fifty or sixty years, and that it therefore cannot be true, or else it would not have been unknown until so late a period of the world. To this we reply, that the objection is based on a false position. *It is not true* that the doctrine of the restitution is a new-fangled scheme. On the contrary, there is ample evidence of its extensive prevalence from the time of the Apostles to the middle of the third century, when the celebrated ORIGEN publicly taught it, and wrote in its favor. It prevailed also until the middle of the sixth century, without being condemned in the church. After the first rejection of the sentiment, about this period, traces of it are discoverable, during the dark ages, down to the period of the reformation. It has since spread extensively in Germany, the very cradle of religious emancipation, until, at this day, scarcely an intelligent man is found in that country who believes the doctrine of endless misery. The Rev. Mr. Dwight, (Presbyterian,) in his book of travels through Germany, says, that in this nation, containing thirty-four millions of people, with her twenty two universities, sixteen thousand university students, and one thousand professors in the same, he saw but one person who believed the dogma of an endless hell. He also says, that the divines of that country are acknowledged to be a century in advance of all others in biblical learning, and have 'done more to enlarge the knowledge of sacred criticism, than all the nations of Europe.'

The doctrine has had distinguished advocates also in every part of the civilized world. In England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Prussia, France, Switzerland, and even Italy, it has had an existence, through all modern times, to the present day, many of the highest dignitaries of the church having cherished and defended it. For a full account of the pre-

valence of the sentiment, the reader will please consult the Ancient and Modern Histories of Universalism, by Ballou & Whittemore.

But suppose we admit the objection for a moment. How will it operate in the case of our Protestant brethren? Is it not a two edged sword that will cut equally well 'fore and aft?' It is acknowledged that we are indebted to the exertions of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon and others, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, for the origin of the many sects which now divide Christendom. Accordingly the different denominations of Calvinists, the Lutherans and Episcopalians can boast of an age of only three centuries, and the numerous order of Episcopal Methodists are just rising of one hundred years old—the same having been founded by the Wesleys, in the year 1729! What then is the force of this objection? Why simply this:—that the Jewish religion being the *oldest* is the *nearest the truth*. Next to this, and the first under the Christian dispensation, which now exists as a sect, is the Catholic. Then comes the faith of Mahomet, which was founded in the beginning of the seventh century. After this, the Eastern or Greek Church, which separated from the Latin about the middle of the ninth century. So that if a doctrine is to be judged *true* or *false* by the *length of time* it has been held by its advocates, in a distinctive character, we shall all have to go back to old 'Mother Church,' and despite of our convictions of her peculiar claim to the title of 'Mother of Harlots,' confess our manifold divisions and wanderings, and entreat her pardon! All Protestants must come to this, on the principle of the objection under consideration, and if perchance, her holiness should waive her claims to the exclusive privilege of viewing the world as one great flock, made to be shorn or eaten, according to the good pleasure of her shepherds, why then, we shall all have to turn Turks, substitute the Alcoran for the Bible—go a pilgrimage to Mecca, &c. in order to secure for ourselves a seat, under the golden tree *Tuba*, in the Moslem paradise, where bloom the sweetest flowers and grow the richest fruits, and where dwell the beau-

tiful *houries* for the pleasure and comfort of the faithful!

This objection, moreover, is itself, *not new*, for the same was brought, though in a better spirit, by the Jews against the Apostles of our Lord: "May we know what this *new* doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is? For thou bringest certain *strange* things to our ears." If therefore, the *novelty* of this doctrine is an objection to it—then was Christianity in the same dilemma when *it* was first promulgated.

OBJECTION 2. "UNIVERSALISM IS A VERY OLD DOCTRINE."—Some wise ones among the heralds of wrath have alleged that this doctrine was preached first by the Devil, in the year of the world *one*. For this idea they are indebted to the critical acumen of a *negro* preacher of the name of Lemuel Haynes, who lived in Vermont some twenty years since. If true, objection No. 1 is of course answered, as the doctrine cannot be both *new* and *old*. But did the Devil preach the first Universalist sermon ever delivered, when he said to the woman in Eden, 'ye shall not surely die?' By no means. This answer of the serpent was in direct opposition to the prohibition of the Almighty—'*In the day* thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' Now, as Jehovah said, so say *we*. 'In the day' you transgress, you will surely die the only death which could have been inflicted on Adam, the first delinquent. Not so, says the Serpent or Devil. 'Ye shall not surely die,' as God has threatened, and not so also, say the partialists; men are *not* punished *in the day* or season of transgression, and *never will be*, if they will only repent in time. Thus, they make out old Satan a true prophet, and impeach the veracity of the Most High God! Besides, who are they who preach up the superior cunning and power of the 'prince of darkness?' Who are they who more religiously believe in his Satanic Majesty than they do in their Creator? Who contend for the endless triumph of Satan's reign over the captain of man's salvation—Jesus Christ? And in whose system of faith is a belief in the Devil a prominent and essential item? Certainly not ours. We have no fellowship with him in any respect, but on the contrary, believe and preach that the Devil shall be destroyed, and

that his kingdom shall come to an end. Not so, however, with limitarians; for the Devil is one of the principal pillars in their religious temples. Without his aid they can do nothing. With him, as the scarecrow general of all the nether regions, they can do wonderful things in the way of frightening people into the outward service of God, and into the bosom of the Church.

OBJECTION 3. "SO FEW BELIEVE THE SENTIMENT," in comparison with those who believe the opposite. This objection has been partly answered under the first head, but not fully. We grant the fact, that comparatively few of the whole world have believed in the glorious sentiment of impartial and universal love; but what then? What advantage will the admission give the objector? Just none at all. For at the present day, about one half of the whole population of the globe are Pagans, Jews and Mahometans, leaving the other half—of from 400 to 500 millions, to be divided among the Catholics, the Greek Church and the various orders of believing and unbelieving Protestants! According to this argument therefore, the Pagan religion is the true one, because it now has, and always has had, an immense preponderance of numbers in its favor. Every one will see then, that the objection has not a particle more weight against Universalism than against any other system of faith in the world. Besides, if the scale of truth is to be regulated by numbers, Christianity itself is proven to be a fable, inasmuch as not one twentieth part of the inhabitants of the earth have yet practically received it. This objection is however speedily giving way, for, if numbers constitute truth, *we* are fast ripening for the honors of *infallibility*, as we now rank as a denomination about the *fourth* in number in the United States; and some of our partialist friends, who arrogate to themselves the title of 'orthodox,' have fallen far below us in the guilt of heresy, according to their own standard of judgment in the matter.

OBJECTION 4. THE NATURAL APPREHENSIONS OF MANKIND, it is said, prove the dogma of endless suffering, as this

notion is generally entertained by the heathen nations, who could not have derived it from any other source than *innate impressions* implanted in the breasts of all, by the Almighty. To this we reply, that it is by no means certain, or even probable, that mankind have generally any such natural apprehensions. We perceive, to the contrary, in an account not long since given to the public, of the religious views and customs of some of the North-Western Indian tribes, by Mr. Catlin, an artist, who spent considerable time among them. He says as follows: "They all believe in a future existence, and in a future state of rewards and punishments, *and* (as do all other tribes which I have yet visited) they believe that *punishment* is *not eternal*, but *commensurate with their sins.*" Here then, is a portion of the Pagan world which have no apprehensions of *endless* woe. But granting it to be a fact, that the Pagan world does entertain such an opinion, and that this affords an argument in favor of its truth, shall we not be justified in carrying out the argument so as to embrace many other heathen notions? For instance—The Indians of the Upper Missouri believe in a Bad Spirit or Devil, who existed previous to the Good Spirit, and is far superior in power! These Indians, likewise, have other queer notions. Says Mr. Catlin, "Living as they do, in a climate where they suffer extremely from cold in the severity of their winters, they have very naturally reversed our ideas of heaven and hell. The latter they describe to be a country very far to the North, of barren and hideous aspect, and covered with eternal snows. The torments of this freezing place they describe as most excruciating. While heaven they suppose to be in a warmer and delightful latitude, where nothing is felt but the keenest enjoyment, and where the country abounds in buffalo and other luxuries of life." Beside all this, they have reversed the situations of the Good and Bad Spirit. The latter they imagine is located in heaven, where he is employed in tempting the happy, and the former, they believe, dwells in hell, for the purpose of tormenting his enemies! Now, if we are to establish the truth of endless misery from

the notions of the heathen, on the subject, let us go the whole figure, and adopt all other of their peculiar ideas. Not only so, but we shall, on this principle, have to become worshippers of a multitude of Gods, for it is a fact, that all nations have been inclined to Polytheism, until carefully taught otherwise. Witness the prevalence of idolatry in the world, when the worship of the "*One* Living and True God" was carefully taught the people of Israel, by their great leader, Moses. And so also, to this day, throughout the Pagan world. The objection then, is of no weight, were the premises conceded.

OBJECTION 5. "IF ALL MEN ARE GOING TO BE SAVED, WHAT IS THE USE OF PREACHING?"—Just as much surely, and more, if a *part* are going to be saved and a *part* to be damned, whether this is the result of God's election and reprobation, or within the compass of his Omniscience. The Calvinist believes that some of the human family are, from all eternity, elected to be the heirs of eternal bliss, and the rest are "passed by to dishonor and wrath," or *reprobated* to endless despair, and that the number of each is so definite and fixed, that it cannot be increased or diminished—and the Arminian acknowledges the "fore-knowledge" of God, in relation to all the events of time and eternity, which is the same thing as if he had predetermined every thing—as nothing can happen contrary to, or without said foreknowledge. Well then, what is the use of preaching, erecting churches, praying, &c. if the eternal destiny of all men is positively fixed, ages before they were born? Does the Calvinist expect to *save* those whom God has determined to *damn?* Or does the Arminian suppose that he can rescue himself or his neighbor from the doom of an endless hell, if the Almighty, who "sees the end from the beginning," *foresaw*, with infallible certainty, that this would be his condition throughout eternity? Even on the supposition of man's "free agency," the question is not altered, as it must be conceded that God *knew* when he gave this agency what would be the result in each particular case—whether man would use it for a good

purpose, or the contrary. "What then is the use of preaching," under such circumstances? Just none whatever. For let it be remembered, that in the light of this objection, the sum and substance of Christianity consists in securing an escape from hell torments! This object out of sight, and the objector confesses that the religion of Christ has no value in his eyes. He would not preach or pray, were it not to secure *eternal* bliss—the *present salvation* of the gospel, (a deliverance from sin and moral evil) and the joys of virtue having no charms for *him!* Having a different view of the matter, and believing that religion has present benefits, and that the Christian system was designed for the comfort and consolation of man here upon the earth, we can consistently call upon all to give "praise and thanksgiving" to God. Our object in preaching is, most assuredly, not for the purpose of affecting the eternal welfare of any, but to bring them to a "knowledge of the truth" of the paternal care and continued loving kindness of Jehovah, and to inspire that *hope* which is as "an anchor to the soul" in all the trying scenes and circumstances of life. "Good news" is always cheering, and while we can find many reasons for promulgating that which is calculated to impart pleasure and happiness, we confess our inability to discover any good reason for preaching bad news, even "if true," when it is clear that such preaching only embitters our present joys, while it cannot prevent our suffering the fate that awaits us in the providence of God.

This objection might also bear equally well against any revelation from God to man. For it may, with the same propriety, be asked, *if it be true* that God meant to bless all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth in and through Abraham and his seed, what was the use of his inspiring his servant Moses to record the purpose? If Deity designed to send his well-beloved son to make a "propitiation for the sins of the whole world," and that he should "come out of Nazareth" and live and die in Judea, what use was there in inspiring the prophets to predict the event? It would certainly have taken place any how, whether it had been communica-

ted or concealed. Again, if God designs to save *only a part* of the human race in eternity, and the knowledge of this fact is of no benefit to that part in this life, what was the use of any revelation on the subject? The "elect" could not lose any thing by being kept in ignorance of the future, and why torment the non-elect or those *not foreknown* as the heirs of salvation, before their time, with the bitter anticipations of eternal woe? Alas! how cruel are the tender mercies of partialism. In kindness to man, therefore, let universal love be preached, even though (God forgive the thought) *it is not* "the truth as it is in Jesus." If this doctrine be a delusion, it is a glorious delusion, and its peculiar adaptation to the wants and desires of sinful mortals and its unrivalled capability to pluck the thorn from the heart of sorrow, and wipe the tears from the brow of grief, might well serve as apologies, if any were needed, for the zeal manifested in its propagation, although it should prove in the end as baseless as its enemies would wish to make appear but cannot desire.

OBJECTION 6. "BETTER BE ON THE SAFE SIDE—OR TWO CHANCES BETTER THAN ONE."—This is about the "last shot in the locker" of the partialist, when defeat seems staring him in the face. Like a drowning man catching at a straw, he grasps this cobweb argument, as if he really hoped by it to make good his retreat from the well-directed aim of his adversary. *Prudence* would dictate, says the objector, that a man should embrace the doctrine of endless misery as the safest course he could pursue, for if that prove false Universalism will take him up—or in other words, it is better to have *two chances* for salvation instead of *one!* This objection is based on the supposition that a man can believe precisely as he pleases on any subject, or that the exercise of faith is entirely dependent on the will. But every reflecting person must perceive the fallacy of the proposition; for that operation of the mind called *faith*, is always the result of so much evidence addressed to the understanding as is sufficient to convince the same, and is therefore neither praiseworthy nor blameworthy, in itself considered. The objection implies also, that it would be more safe for a man falsely to profess a

belief in endless woe, than honestly and conscientiously to profess a belief in universal salvation, or in other words, that Deity is so much better pleased at being represented an implacable ruler and revengeful tyrant, than a merciful Judge and benevolent Father, that he will the more willingly secure the salvation of those who slander his adorable name, than of those who in sincerity attribute to him every gracious perfection, in infinite fulness! It would really seem that such objectors think to escape the searching vigilance of the All-seeing Eye, when motives like this are presented for a profession of a faith in an omnipotent Devil and an endless hell! It is indeed boldly affirming that the *hypocritical* professor of endless damnation is thereby entitled to an *extra chance* in the grand lottery of salvation, over the honest man who professes, as his judgment approves, a faith in the unbounded goodness of God! And is it indeed true, that the Gospel of Christ is a system of *chance* or accident—that nothing is certain or definite, but that doubt and darkness rest upon the issue of events, which infinite wisdom has ordained! Rather would we say that there is no 'safe side' but *truth*, and that the idea of *chance* is inadmissible in the providence of God. "He is not a man that he should lie, or the son of man that he should repent—hath he said and will he not do it." We want no *chances*, therefore, of salvation, when we have "assurance made doubly sure," by the promise, purpose and oath of Deity, of ultimate and unending blessedness for man. On the score of wordly policy, in this time-serving and interest-seeking age, it may for a while be a "safe side" business, to go with the tide of popular prejudice, but we doubt not, that in the end, it will be found, as in other matters, so in this, that "honesty is the best policy"—the honesty of faith and the sincerity of profession.

OBJECTION 7. "IT IS A GOOD DOCTRINE TO LIVE BY, BUT WILL NOT DO TO DIE BY."—The first part of this objection contains an admission in favor of universal salvation, which cannot be granted in favor of the opposite system. It is indeed a "good doctrine to *live* by," and why not to "die

by ?" Reader, if a particular article of food is found to serve you well for breakfast and dinner, how do you know it will not answer your purpose for supper, until you make the trial? And if a doctrine which is found to support the soul through all the vicissitudes of life—a doctrine whose hopes are heavenly, and whose consolations are divine—cannot give joy and peace in the hour of dissolution, how can you expect to be supported when "heart and flesh fail," by a different sentiment—one that plants thorns instead of roses in the bed of affliction! Would you grasp at a straw floating on the surface of life's ocean, rather than trust to a well-found ship, whose anchors were of tried efficacy? The objection is moreover one of conjecture merely. He who makes it has never tried the doctrine, either in life or death, and cannot *know* any thing concerning the sustaining influence of a faith which he *has not*. It is also opposed by facts of every day occurrence, for thousands have passed the portals of the grave, whose death was as triumphant as their lives were full of rejoicing.

But let us examine the objection a little more closely. Here is a man, whose whole conduct evinces that he is a child of grace. He is a member of a popular Church, and a "burning and shining light" in the Christian course. His piety is deep and ardent, and his hopes of immortality are bright and glorious. He is sure of a heavenly crown, having "fought the good fight and kept the faith." Now, when such a man is about to leave the world, will it add to his own anticipations of happiness to realize that millions of the human race will eventually go down to the shades of eternal night? By no means; yet such is precisely the force of the objection under consideration. It supposes that a man cannot die happy *unless he believes* in *the eternal damnation* of his fellow creatures! It supposes that it is a most *uncomfortable* reflection to a dying mortal, to think of meeting again all his brethren and sisters of the great family of man—a "ransomed and glorified throng" in the paradise of God! How strange the idea, that any one should be supposed to be *better* qualified to

pass the dark "valley and shadow of death," by having more faith in an omnipotent Demon and burning flames, than in the unlimited and unchangeable benevolence of the August Judge, in whose presence he is about to enter!

But perhaps it is meant by the objection, that many who profess universal salvation in life and health, find it all delusion in the hour of sickness and pain, and that many renounce the sentiment at such times of trial, and embrace the opposite. Not a few marvellous cases are published, setting forth the awful fate of some wicked Universalist, who, on coming to die, had "renounced his sentiments and *died* in despair." Well, suppose it true, as it is represented—what does it prove? Why, nothing more nor less than the *despair* of the man was owing to his *loss* of his former faith in the super-abundant grace of God! It was *not Universalism* that caused him to "die in despair," but *partialism*, which he had embraced in his dying moments. While he believed in the former he was well enough, but the spoiler came—"ghostly comforters" crowded round his bed and frightened the poor soul at once out of his senses and religious hopes—and the agony of *despair* closed the scene! And no wonder! for such it seems to us is the legitimate result of a strong faith in one's own eternal ruin, in the prison-house of the damned. It is impossible that reason can retain her empire over the mind in distinct view of the curling flames and boiling floods of infinite wrath ready to spend their awful fury upon the doomed spirit. He is more than human who can realize this fate for himself, and stand unmoved at the appalling prospect.

OBJECTION 8. "UNIVERSALISM IS A LICENTIOUS DOCTRINE."—Were it not for *fear of hell*, says the *pious* objector, I would "take my fill of sin;" I would lie, steal, defraud and murder, if it came in my way—and so would others, if your doctrine were to prevail! Possibly, those who thus object may speak *the truth* in regard to *themselves*, but we demur to their judgment concerning others. If *they* are so base at heart, and so in love with sin that they only refrain from it through the slavish fear of future torment, that is no reason

why others may not practise virtue and refrain from vice through purer motives. We pity the professing Christian who will thus show a *disposition* to commit all manner of iniquity, for this objection is nothing less than a confession that the thoughts and intents of the heart are exceedingly vile and wicked.

But how is it licentious to believe in the unlimited benevolence of God—that he is the Father of all men and will finally purify all his children—make them white in the blood of the Lamb and redeem them from death? The like charge may, with equal propriety, be made against the faith of every professor of religion, who imagines he has secured for himself a seat in the abodes of the blest. Such a person believes in his own salvation, certainly. Well, does this assurance cause the partialist Christian to commit all manner of iniquity? Does he, who feels the love of God shed abroad in his heart, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, indulge the desire to trample under foot the laws of that gracious Parent who has so favored him? By no means. If, then, the faith of an individual in his own salvation is not licentious, how happens it, that his belief in the salvation of others has such a baneful influence? For our lives, we cannot see what our faith, concerning the final doom of the rest of the human race, has to do with our moral conduct, or how it can bear upon others so as to make them licentious. Suppose, for instance, every one believed in his own individual salvation, and that the influence of this is the same as that which takes place in the case of every believer, to produce gratitude, and hope, and love in his breast;—where is there any room for the prevalence of licentiousness? There is none whatever. Besides all this, facts contradict the assumption. Bad as many professing Universalists may be, they are not worse than their neighbors. Witness the result of an examination made a few years since in the New York State Prisons. Out of several hundred prisoners there confined, not one of them was a believer in the doctrine of Universal grace. Look too at the land of Germany, where the sentiment is generally entertained, and what do you see? A more moral and upright people

cannot be found upon the face of the earth. We might point also to places in our own land, where this doctrine is generally cherished, and where peace and good order prevail. But it is unnecessary. To allow any weight to the objection, it must be shown that all the wickedness in the world has been owing to the belief of Universal Salvation. It must be proven that all the bloody persecutions which have existed between professedly Christian sects, and which have crimsoned the page of ecclesiastical history with the deepest dye, have had their origin in the belief that "God is good to all" his creatures. The wars between Catholics and Protestants, and between various Protestant orders—the murder of Michael Servetus by one John Calvin, for opinion's sake—the hanging of old women for witches, and the imprisonment, scourging and death of the Quakers, some few years ago, in New England, must likewise be traced to the same cause! Yea, to add all the weight possible to the objection, it must be demonstrated that the score of "orthodox" clergymen, who have within two or three years become inmates of the State Prisons, brought on their fate by indulging in a belief of Universal love! In short, nothing less will suffice to establish the point, that the faith of the final "restitution" is licentious, than positive proof that it has been the cause of *all* the crime ever committed, and that all the piety in the world has been owing to the opposite sentiment.

The objection, in truth, makes all religion to have had its origin in the fear of hell and the devil, for it declares that were it not for this fear, *love* to God and man, which is the sum and substance of Christian precept and duty, could not exist! But what kind of *piety* is this? Is it an acceptable sacrifice to Deity to have his creatures worship him through fear of his vengeance? What! serve God through fear of the Devil! How strange the idea, but yet how true, if this objection be sustained. On the contrary—love begets love. "We love God because he *first* loved us;" and the more this prior love is displayed, the more will the effect be extended. No man, however, can love God, when he is repre-

sented as an implacable Tyrant or revengeful Judge, neither can any one fulfil the second command in the law, which is "love to his neighbor," unless he views that neighbor as a brother of one common family, and as co-heir with himself of the same heavenly inheritance, provided by the munificence of the Father of all.

It is equally apparent, that as men judge of the character and conduct of their Creator, so will be their own feelings and conduct. If the Almighty hates a part of his creatures, they will do so likewise, especially if they imagine they are themselves favorites of heaven and that others are reprobates. And this *hatred* of our fellow men is the opposite of genuine piety. How then can a doctrine which inculcates *love* to *all*, on the only ground on which this principle can be exercised—that of the equality of men by nature and the impartiality of the blessings of heaven—be deemed demoralizing? As well might it be contended that the soul-cleansing and life-giving precepts of Christ, whose aim is to renew the mind and waken the love and gratitude of the inmost soul, are calculated to make men licentious and abandoned. The thing is impossible.

OBJECTION 9. "UNIVERSALISM IS CONGENIAL TO THE DEPRAVED HEART OF MAN."—In reply to this objection, we remark, that if it is meant that the doctrine in question is agreeable to the natural desires of the human heart, we most cheerfully admit the fact, but cannot allow that those desires are in consequence of some *innate depravity* in man. On the contrary, it is the desire of the great and good, that the doctrine of Universal Salvation may prove true—yea, it is the fervent prayer and wrestling supplication of all the righteous of the earth, that all men shall finally be restored to heaven and happiness! And are these holy aspirations of the pious soul evidence of a depravity of heart which cannot be eradicated, except by substituting in their stead the partial and contracted views of the rigid Limitarian? By such a standard, the objector, if he be a Christian professor, condemns himself. All the prayers of such an individual con-

tradict the sentiment, or else compel us to admit the conclusion, that those who are so earnest in the conversion of the world to God, and who preach, pray and carry on the vast machinery of missions, for the avowed purpose of saving the whole world from endless ruin, are themselves the vilest o the vile—complete specimens of total depravity! while those, on the contrary, who hope and pray, (if any there be,) that all mankind will be consigned to endless perdition, give the best evidence of their own piety and renewedness of spirit! This is the fair inference from the premises laid down, but is repugnant to every principle of common sense. We have, indeed, often heard that a willingness on the part of the sinner to be damned himself, for the glory of God, was a peculiar and distinguishing feature of the true faith, but was not before aware that a willingness or strong desire for the damnation of all the world besides, was striking evidence of the *perfection* of *holiness!* But so it wouuld seem, if it be true, that a wish for, and belief in, the salvation of the whole family of man is an evidence of depravity of heart, or, is a doctrine specially congenial with the *depraved* desires of the human breast!

OBJECTION 10. "CHRIST'S PREACHING ALARMED THE UNGODLY," which could not have been the case if universal salvation be true. Admit the fact that the Saviour of the world did threaten some of the wicked in his day, and we would inquire who these wicked people were. Were they not the *religious* class of that age—the High Priests, Scribes and Pharisees—the self-righteous of the land—the great sticklers for the outward forms and ceremonies of religion? Most assuredly, such was the fact. Upon no others did Christ pronounce any severe judgments, but against this order of men, while he "ate and drank with publicans and sinners," whose friend he was. The Pharisees and Rulers of the people were the most inveterate in their hatred against the Son of God, and trembled for the stability of their own superstitions and customs; and these were the persons who then were wicked, and who were alarmed at the preaching of Christ, not indeed on account of their sins, but because their *craft* was in danger. And so it is at the present day. The

most virulent opponents of impartial grace are to be found among the professors of Christianity—the self-righteous Pharisees of the age, while the "common people," now, as formerly, hear with gladness the good news of salvation. If we will examine also, the whole tenor of Christ's preaching, we will search in vain for any threat of vengeance against this class of the human race. Our Lord never preached *hell* but to the wicked Jews, and that was the hell of *Gehenna*. Nor did the Apostles season their discourses with the salt of endless fire and the smoke of burning brimstone, as do modern preachers. Witness the extraordinary success of the Apostolic Ministry, an account of which is given us in the 2d and 3d chapters of the Book of the Acts, &c. At one time three thousand souls were added to the Church, and again, five thousand, when the words *hell* and *damnation* were not once used, except the former in reference to the soul of Christ not being left in hell, Acts ii. 27-31. On the contrary, Peter preached the "restitution of all-things," (Acts iii. 21,) and the promise of blessing made to Abraham, "saying in thy seed shall *all* the kindreds of the earth be blessed." (25, 26.) This was rank heresy in Peter—nothing less than the "damnable heresy" of universal salvation, according to the judgment of the Spiritual Teachers of this age. True, we read in one place that "great *fear* came upon all the Church" and others, but it was on occasion of the awful temporal death of Ananias and Sapphira—a little more Universalism, by the way, as it is a part of our creed, that the "righteous are recompensed *in the earth*, so also the wicked and the sinner."

OBJECTION 11. "IF ALL MEN ARE TO FARE ALIKE IN A FUTURE WORLD, THERE IS NO MOTIVE TO VIRTUE," &c.—The sum and substance of this objection is, that the idea of the damnation of our wicked neighbors will enkindle the zeal of the righteous anew, in the service of God here; and the sight thereof from the battlements of heaven will enhance the happiness of the saints throughout eternity! The objection moreover, is not a modern one, the spirit of the same being well illustrated by our Lord, in the parable of the vineyard.

Those laborers who came in at the *eleventh* hour shared alike in the bounty of the master of the vineyard, with those who "bore the burden and heat of the day." The latter complained of this equality of recompense, although they had received all they earned and all the master agreed to give. So that it was doing them no injustice to reward the others—even more than they merited. If therefore, the righteous have no other motive to persevere in the Christian course than the idea of an infinite difference of reward in eternity between themselves and others they deem wicked, we think their situation a very deplorable one.. Such a selfish regard for one's own interest, at the expense of the eternal welfare of others, is, at least, destitute of true Christian principle, say nothing of its entire want of humanity and benevolence.

OBJECTION 12. "NO CHANGE AFTER DEATH—AS THE TREE FALLS SO IT WILL LIE, AND AS DEATH LEAVES US, SO JUDGMENT WILL FIND US."—This objection is supposed to be taken from scripture, but we have placed it under this head, because we have never been able to find the chapter and verse where the passage occurs. Like other common phrases, its origin may be traced to that unwarrantable practise adopted by some spiritual Doctors, of *manufacturing scripture* to suit their purposes, where the record of inspiration is not sufficiently explicit in favor of their creeds! Nevertheless, the objection has some weight with those who never think for themselves on these subjects, and therefore, is deserving of a passing notice.

The idea that this life is a state of probation for the next, and that *as* men are prepared at the close of their earthly career, *so* will be their doom for perpetual good or evil in the world to come, has conjured up this erroneous notion of "no change after death," as an invincible argument against universal salvation. Many persons are not duly prepared in life, but die *sinful* and *impenitent*, ERGO, they must be miserable forever, because there is no further day of grace or opportunity for repentance. We admit, that were the notion *true* that there is "no change after death," the doctrine of

universal blessedness could not be substantiated. But on the same principle the doctrine of *partial* blessedness will fall to the ground, because there is no mortal man who is a fit subject for the abodes of glory *when* he leaves the scenes of earth. All men are sinners—all are imperfect—all are under the bondage of corruption, while they sojourn in this tabernacle of clay—and we are assured that "corruption cannot inherit incorruption." How then can any expect to be saved, in the world to come, without a great and important *change*—even from sin, mortality and corruption, to holiness, incorruption and immortality—after the death of the body? When the partialist, therefore, can show how it is that *he* expects to attain to a seat among angels and the "spirits of just men made perfect," without he is thus qualified *after* he leaves this imperfect state, he will find a reason why *all* men may be made partakers of the same immortal inheritance.

Again—the objection, if granted, proves too much in another particular. The righteous as well as the wicked experience, while on the earth, many sorrows and afflictions which are grievous to be borne, and which mar the happiness they might otherwise enjoy. Now, on the supposition that there is "no change after death," the same state of things will exist hereafter that we find here—the same trials—the same infirmities—the same imperfections and the same troubles and sufferings will be experienced by the "saints" in eternity, which they have experienced here upon the earth! Besides, the wicked enjoy many of the blessings of Providence—they "eat, drink and be merry" with their earthly associates and friends, and will continue so to enjoy themselves in sensual indulgence and pleasure in another world, provided, there is "no change after death." In short, the world to come, on this principle, will be a *fac simile* of the present life, neither better nor worse! So much for the notion under consideration.

We are happy, however, in the hope and belief that there will be a great and glorious change after death. "We shall all be changed, in a moment—in the twinkling of an eye—at

the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." Otherwise, there is indeed no hope for man; but an eternal night of darkness rests upon his tomb. The resurrection to a future life is itself a "change after death," and to deny this change is therefore to join hands with the reviler of revelation, and to degrade the human race to a level with the "brute that perisheth."

OBJECTION 13. "UNIVERSALISM IS INFIDELITY IN DISGUISE."—Some of the preachers of condemnation take great pains to convince their congregations that Deists, Atheists and Universalists, are one and the same sort of people. This classification is a very common one, but it is no less false, on that account, as will appear directly. What, we ask, is the meaning of the term "infidel"? The primary meaning attached thereto is, *one who is unfaithful*, but the popular acceptation of the word is *one who is an unbeliever*. Wherein, then, is the term justly applied to the Universalist? Does the reader enquire, do you believe in a God? We answer, yes. Do you believe in a revelation of God's will, through his Son Jesus Christ, to the world of mankind? Most certainly we do. Are we asked again—Do you believe in "three Gods in one," and in a Devil and Hell in a future world? We answer *no*, and give as a reason, that *so much faith* was never required by the Master, while he sojourned here upon the earth. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," was the simple requisition in the days of the Saviour. He never required of his disciples to subscribe to a confession of faith or creed which recognized the existence of his Satanic Majesty and such like notions, which are now deemed vitally essential parts of the Christian system! So far then from being "infidels," there is no one further removed from infidelity than the conscientious Universalist. He believes more fully in Jesus of Nazareth and in his power to save, than any other professor of Christianity. He views him as a complete Saviour, and is confident he will accomplish the work he came to do, when he yielded himself up as the crucified "ransom for all" the sons of men. And can the partialist objector say

as much? Does he believe that Christ is a full and complete Saviour? Certainly not. Does he allow that "of all things delivered unto him by the Father he will lose nothing, but raise them up again at the last day"? By no means. Then *he* is an *infidel.* In fact, if we were to go in search of infidelity, and did not wish to be disappointed in our labor, the first place we should visit would be the pulpits of partialist temples, and the next the body of the Church called "orthodox," in this our day; for we verily believe there is less true faith in the Redeemer of mankind there to be found, than almost any where else. On the contrary, the faith of the Universalist is already full. It is the faith of Abraham, which covenanted a blessing to all the nations, kindreds and families of the earth. It is the faith, moreover, of Paul—"the substance (or foundation) of things *hoped* for," a "hope which maketh not ashamed," and a "faith that works by love." If this be infidelity, it is only another name for Christianity itself, and we are content to receive the appellation thence derived, rather as an honorable cognomen than a word of reproach.

OBJECTION 14. "UNIVERSALISM DENIES THE MERCY OF GOD IN THE SALVATION OF SINNERS," because it represents that all men are punished for the sins they may commit. If, it is said, men suffer justly and fully for all their iniquities, it is folly to say that such are pardoned, for there is no room for the exercise of mercy in their case. Here again we find an error in the premises. It is falsely assumed, that salvation consists in remitting the penalty of sin, not in taking away the sin itself. But what saith the scriptures? Christ came to "take away the sins of the world." "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their *sins.*" "He gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity," &c. There is no intimation in the Bible about men being saved from punishment already merited, or from *any punishment* due to transgression. On the contrary, it is the explicit doctrine of that book, that God "will by no means clear the guilty," but that he will "recompense to every man according to his works." Nor is the forgiveness

of sin, in the scripture sense of the phrase, incompatible with punishment; for, saith the Lord, by his prophet Isaiah, "speak ye comfortably unto Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished—that her iniquity is pardoned—for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins," xl. 2. See also Exodus xxxiv. 6, 7, to the same prophet. But, to place the matter in the strongest light, let us bring forward a supposed case which has frequently been presented as giving force to the objection under consideration: Suppose a man convicted of some atrocious crime, for which he is sentenced to the State Prison for ten years. At the end of this period he is dismissed from prison, having served out the full time imposed by the law. Would it not be folly to say of such a man, that he had been pardoned his trespass? And could he not justly *demand* a release, on the score of having made full satisfaction to the violated law? Certainly he could. And so, on the idea that men are fully punished for their crimes, is it not absurd to talk about the pardoning mercy of God in their case? So reasons the objector, but, as we before remarked, on false grounds—the scripture doctrine of forgiveness being a salvation from *sin* and *not* from *punishment*. To make the case of the criminal parallel with that of the sinner, it must appear that *his being a criminal* and *suffering for his crimes* their proper punishment, *entitles him* to a post of honor in the gift of the Executive! He could demand, it is true, a release from further punishment for the crime for which he had made satisfaction, but no more. So of the sinner. He can justly be punished for all his transgressions, but this will not entitle him to a seat in the courts of bliss. For this he is still indebted to the grace or favor of God as that which forgives his sins, or takes away the power and love and dominion of iniquity in his heart. 'Tis the river of *mercy* which flows from the throne of God which washes out all his guilt and makes him clean from the stain of pollution. And in the case of a trespass by one individual against another, every one can readily understand that the punishment of the transgressor will not, as a matter of course, ensure his forgiveness in the minds of the injured party or that

of his friends. So long as they retain hostile feeling or remain unreconciled, the criminal is not forgiven his transgression, though he may have suffered the full penalty of the law. Punishment and forgiveness are not therefore incompatible with each other.

OBJECTION 15. "THE WICKED FARE BETTER IN THIS LIFE THAN THE RIGHTEOUS"—therefore, there must be a difference in their situations in eternity, in order to equalize matters. The apparent happiness of the wicked, on the earth, has been the fruitful source of many a sinful thought in the minds of those who deem themselves righteous. They are "envious of the foolish," and murmur and repine at their own hard lot, because others are blessed with houses and lands, and the riches of this world, and are able to dash about in fine equipages, while they—humble followers of Jesus, have to travel on foot the thorny and crooked path to heaven, amid much trial and tribulation! Hence the idea is entertained, much to the comfort of these good souls, that by and by there will be a reverse in the situation of affairs, and that they, the Saints, will then bask in the sunshine of God's countenance, while their their haughty neighbors are suffering, like Dives, in the bottomless abyss of hell! Unfortunately, however, for these complainants, they assume premises which cannot be sustained either by the word of God or the experience of man. The scriptures emphatically declare that "there is no peace to the wicked," and "woe unto the wicked, for it shall be ill with him." They also certify, on the contrary, that "in keeping the commandments there is great reward," and "great peace have they who keep thy law." Christ likewise represents that his "yoke is easy and his burden is light," and exhorts the "weary and heavy laden" to come unto him and they should "find rest." The experience of every man will also testify that to be happy we must be good, and that "destruction and misery" are in the path of the transgressor, and that "his way is hard."

But admit the supposition for a moment, that the wicked enjoy more happiness here than the righteous—what then? By what system of analogy do men thence argue, that there

will be a change hereafter in the providence of God? If a course of vice is so pleasant here, and there are, in truth, many solid "pleasures in sin," will not this pleasure be enhanced, in eternity, in proportion to the enlargement of the faculties and powers of the sinner? And if the path of virtue and Christianity is verily one of privation, toil and suffering, here, what is there to prevent the same effects to follow the like cause in a coming world? According to this objection, *hell* will be a happier place than *heaven*, as the "pleasures of sin" can be enjoyed in the former, in infinite fulness, while the troubles of the Christian life will become infinitely excruciating in the latter!

To prove the fallacy of the notion, however, let us advert to the conduct of men. What reputable man envies the happiness of the inebriate? Who covets the manacles of the felon? Who would exchange the enjoyments of a well-ordered life for the boasted felicity of the dissolute and abandoned? No one. Yet there are men, and professing Christians too, who seem to envy the wicked in their career of folly. "Oh! shame where is thy blush."

OBJECTION 16. "UNIVERSALISTS HAVE NO REVIVALS NOR PRAYER MEETINGS."—That we have no revivals of *wrath* we cheerfully admit—but that there is none of the power of "pure and undefiled religion" amongst us can hardly be said with truth. True, we are not very fond of the "earthquake" and the "strong wind" and the "fire" of fanaticism and superstition, nevertheless, if we have the "still small voice of love" gently distilling its blessings "like the dew, or the small rain upon the tender grass," we are content. And as to being a prayer-meeting people, we can perhaps lay no great claim, inasmuch as we prefer *praise* and *thanksgiving* meetings, and our partialist brethren are so zealous in their supplications for *universal* blessings that the necessity for us so to engage is not so apparent! We ought at least to escape censure on this head, seeing our brethren of the opposition have not yet returned to us the prayers which they *borrowed* from us many a long day ago!

OBJECTION 17. "UNIVERSALISM SENDS THE UNWASHED SCOUNDREL TO HEAVEN IN HIS SINS."—Not so, by any manner of means. That no one is happy, here or hereafter, in a course of vice, is the firm belief of Universalists, and they are sure also, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." We send no one to heaven *in his sins*, for the obvious reason that sin is of earthly or fleshly origin, and because we have no account in the record either of men being sinners in eternity, or of sin itself having a resurrection to immortality. The point is taken for granted when it ought to be proved, that men will be raised from the dead *as sinners*, an idea which is at war with the whole tenor of scripture testimony concerning the nature of the resurrection. Only prove that sin will not be finished, but will exist forever, and the question is settled—for there is no truth more clear than that where sin exists there will misery be found. Prove also that men will be sinners in a future world, and we know of no evidence to show that they will ever be any thing else but wretched sufferers. But we rejoice in the prophetic announcement, that Christ will "finish sin, make an end of transgression and bring in everlasting righteousness." It never has been proved, and it never can be proved, that men will have the same sinful nature in eternity they have here upon the earth. And until this is done, it is only a "begging of the question," to offer an objection which implies such a proposition.

OBJECTION 18. "UNIVERSALISM REPRESENTS GOD AS OFTEN TREATING THE WICKED BETTER THAN THE RIGHTEOUS."—The case of the Antedeluvians, who were destroyed by the *flood*, and that of the Sodomites, who perished by *fire* from heaven, are set forth as examples of this treatment. Says the objector, according to Universalism, God sent these wicked people right off to heaven, while righteous Noah and Lot were left to linger out a miserable existence in this "vale of tears." This objection is based on the supposition that mankind are translated immediately from death to glory—an idea which is not peculiar to Universalism. It supposes likewise, that it is to be deemed a great favor to be suddenly ta-

ken out of the world, in some ignominious manner, and a very great misfortune to be suffered to live, to a good old age, in virtue and honor! And do those who thus object act out the principle here avowed? Are they so very anxious to get to heaven, as to be willing to be carried thither by fire, flood or pestilence? On the contrary, we know of no people who are more unwilling to leave this troublesome world than the self-righteous. Witness their terror and consternation when the "pestilence which wasteth at noon day" comes nigh unto their dwellings, and the earnestness with which they seek, when sick, the services of a Physician, to save them from going right off to heaven! Even the "sacramental host of God's elect," as our pious brethren sometimes call themselves, who are so sure of heaven when they die, are by no means solicitous of leaving the world any the sooner because of that assurance.

The truth is, that life is a blessing, and that death, especially sudden death, is deemed an evil. The highest penalty known to our laws is death, and hence it is, that men consider it preferable to be permitted to live to a good old age, in peace and comfort, than to be cut off suddenly, with no other prospect before them but a *long sleep* which knows no waking, until the last trump shall introduce the morning of the resurrection. It is not then favoring the wicked more than the righteous to take them out of the world, by some awful judgment. Besides, the faith of Partialists is liable to a more serious objection. According thereto, a desperate character may take the life of his fellow man, and in consequence forfeits his own to the laws of his country. While under sentence and prior to execution he is visited by a popular clergyman, and in view of his sudden exit from time, he is brought to repentance and faith, and prepared for glory. Now the probability is, that if this man *had not committed murder* he never would have been converted, and hence the inference, according to the spirit of the objection under consideration, that his great wickedness was *rewarded* by immediate translation to heaven, while the poor priest, who was the instru-

ment of his conversion, is *punished* with a continuance in this miserable world, because of his righteousness!

OBJECTION 19. "A GOD ALL MERCY IS A GOD UNJUST."—This figment of a poet's brain is often quoted as Bible truth, and as proof that it would be unjust in Deity to be merciful to all his creatures. But how it would be more unjust to be merciful to *all* than to a *part*, we cannot conceive, nor have those, who imagine God will be merciful to them, showed us how it is, that the justice of Deity will not be violated in their own particular case, by the exhibition of his mercy towards them. "It is a poor rule that will not work both ways." It is a great mistake, moreover, to suppose that the attributes of Deity are opposed to each other—that mercy pleads in behalf of the sinner, and justice, Shylock like, demands the full penalty of the bond—even the pound of flesh! Such an idea represents Deity as "a house divided against itself," which must come to desolation. On the contrary, it is the dictate of common sense, that all the perfections of Jehovah must harmonize—that Justice and Mercy are only modifications of infinite Goodness—and that a perfect agreement of purpose and operation exists between all the Divine Attributes.

OBJECTION 20. "A SUPPOSED CASE."—Suppose, says the objector, that an attrocious wretch, who has spent a long life in every kind of wickedness, should, in the act of murdering a fellow being, be struck dead himself, without space for repentance. What would you do with such a man, and where does he receive his punishment for the last wickedness he meditated in his heart, if not in another world? To this objection, we answer, 1st. That we know not how great may have been the remorse of such a man between the conception of the purpose in his mind and the overt act. 2d. The case supposed resulted in the *sudden death* of the ruffian, which is the greatest punishment that could be inflicted in life. 3d. The sin of which he was guilty was a finite act, the offspring of the *lusts* of the flesh, "whence come wars and fightings." This cause will perish with the body, and the effects must ne-

cessarily cease with it. 4th. All must be "*changed*,"—the greatest saint and the vilest sinner, before they can be happy and 5th, and lastly, we rebut one supposition by another. Suppose a man to be guilty of every crime known—to have imbrued his hands in the blood of hundreds of victims and lived an abandoned life. He takes his "fill of sin," and drinks largely of its pleasures. At length he is arrested, tried and sentenced to death. In the interval between sentence and execution, he is visited by godly ministers, who pray with and for him until they have assurance that his sins have been washed away. His prison repentance secures him from all fear of future woe, and he is swung off the gallows, singing, "I am bound for the kingdom, won't you go to glory with me." Now, we would ask, how has this man received his punishment? It is not granted by Partialists, that men are "recompensed in the earth," and in the case supposed, the death-bed repentance of the culprit saved him from punishment hereafter—though God says he "will by no means clear the guilty." Add to this the probability that some of the victims of this man's violence are weltering in the flames of hell, and the horrid injustice of the case, as sanctioned by the creeds of the day, will be more apparent. When such a case is shown to be consistent with truth, or agreeable to the dictates of justice, it will be time for us to give further attention to the subject.

CHAPTER V.

Objections to the dogma of endless misery.

We object to the doctrine of the *endless* existence of *sin* and *suffering* in the universe of God because it is inconsistent with the perfection of *goodness* in the divine mind. It is impossible to suppose that a Being who possesses the attri-

bute of *goodness* in an infinite degree could permit absolute *evil* to exist as an ultimate object. If God be infinitely good he must of course be good to every creature he has made, because an exception to such a proposition would destroy the infinite or eternal character of this attribute. True, partial evil may and does exist, but *it* is altogether consistent with the operations of divine goodness, on the supposition that it is only the *means* of bringing about a *greater good*. The pain experienced by the creature can be reconciled in no other way with that perfection of Deity.

Now the doctrine of endless misery supposes that a time will come when the goodness of God will cease to operate in favor or behalf of the sinner. The ultimate and unending suffering of such in the torments of hell must be inflicted without any prospect of greater good as the consequence thereof. From endless punishment there is no redemption, and the goodness of God has ceased to be exercised from the moment the culprit receives his final doom. This goodness cannot therefore be infinite or unlimited. Thus, the most glorious attribute of Jehovah is completely annihilated or narrowed down to the limit of a *finite* capacity.

2. The doctrine of endless misery impeaches the infinite *wisdom* of Deity—for it supposes God was not sufficiently *wise* to foresee the end of that system of things created by him according to the suggestion of his infinite goodness, or else he would have contrived another more consistent with the latter attribute. If this awful result of God's creating energy was not foreseen by himself, the charge of a lack of infinite wisdom cannot be evaded—but if it was foreseen, and he did not choose to let his knowledge affect the issue, it proves that the deliberate purpose of absolute evil was resolved on. Hence then the infinite wisdom and the infinite goodness of Jehovah are at war with each other, in council. What was suggested by the latter the former has not so devised as to bring to a successful accomplishment. God is thus represented as divided against himself, a position altogether incompatible with the perfections of a Supreme Being.

3. Endless misery is inconsistent with the almighty *power* of God when connected with his goodness and wisdom, for it implies that God will not be able to accomplish fully and completely, all that he has designed and devised, but that certain difficulties will arise which it will be impossible for God himself to remove out of the way of his final object. No matter what the cause may be which interposes the difficulty—whether from the efforts of a self-existing or created Demon, or from the perverseness of the creature man, *if* endless misery is the final result, the Creator could not have been *able* to prevent it, admitting that he did *not wish* or *design* it. This dogma therefore supposes the goodness, wisdom and power of God do not harmonize for the production of the specified object, or that the latter is deficient to secure what his infinite goodness has suggested, according to a plan devised in infinite wisdom.

4. This doctrine impeaches the *immutability* of Jehovah. He is supposed to have devised a plan of government which he found, on trial, to be deficient, so that he *changed* his original purposes in regard to mankind, because of the unexpected transgression of our first parents. The "*eternal*" death of Adam, and by consequence, his posterity, was the result, it is supposed, of this change of purpose—thus making out that the perverseness of his creatures compelled Deity to devise a *new* and radically different system of things from that he at first instituted. All the system of partialism has its foundation upon this supposed fact of the changeable character of God—for the infinite atonement made for finite transgression and the eternal punishment of the sinner, are matters supposed to have been devised subsequent to the eating of forbidden fruit by Adam. These were not the primary objects of the Deity, but became necessary to remedy those breaches in his plan made by the cunning of the Evil one. Such ideas not only prove that God is a changeable Being, and by so doing, deny not only another perfection of his nature—*his immutability*, but falsify the Bible itself. It is there recorded that with God there is "no variableness nor shadow of turn-

ing." "I am the Lord, I change not," says he, by the mouth of his prophet.

5. This doctrine is objected to, because it impeaches the *justice* of Deity. "God will render to every man *according* to his works." A *just* recompense for sin will undoubtedly be rendered, but no one in his sober moments will admit that it will be according to broad and impartial justice for God to inflict unending pain—millions and millions of years—yea, throughout a vast eternity, and as long as He himself shall exist, as a fair equivalent for the transgressions of comparatively but a *moment* of this mortal existence! The idea is monstrous! Suppose we should be told that it would be just in a human government to enact a law, punishing with a lingering death an infant child for the crime of parental disobedience. Would we not reject the proposition with disdain, as altogether inconsistent with the plainest dictates of justice? Surely we would, and yet the disproportion of such a punishment with such an offence falls *infinitely* short of that implied in the doctrine combatted. The most that could be demanded, according to exact justice, would be to punish for the time indulged in sin. If a man live fifty years in sin he could *justly* be punished for the same space of time, and in a degree corresponding to the guilt incurred; and if it can be proved that this punishment is not rendered to every man in this state of existence, we should not object to its being paid in another. But the idea of *endless* misery is utterly opposed to all our notions of the most rigid justice, and is infinitely more preposterous than if a million of worlds such as ours should be placed in one scale of a balance, and a single grain of sand in the other, with the expectation that the beam would be poised equably, and indicate their weight to be exactly proportioned, the one to the other. We therefore reject the dogma, not only from a consideration of the claims of justice in the abstract, but from the fact, that the *justice* of God is no ways opposed to the perfect harmony of the divine attributes, as is virtually urged by the advocates of endless hell torments.

6. This doctrine is opposed to the nature and (if we may

'o speak) the very *essence* of Jehovah—which is *Love.* "God is love," says the Apostle John, and if so, he always was and ever will remain of the same distinguishing character. He is "Benevolence" itself, and of course all his purposes and designs in regard to his children must be in accordance with this *sum total* of his Divine Perfections, which will not admit of any of the objects of his unchanging love suffering interminable unguish. If endless misery be *true*, it is superlatively absurd to say of its author and contriver that *He* is a *God of Love.* If infinite *love* should contrive such an awful place as an endless pit of burnings, in the name of all that is reasonable, what kind of a place would infinite *malignity* conjure up? Look at it reader. Did the Apostle give a just description of the character of Jehovah? Did he speak the truth when he breathed forth those emphatically glorious words? If so, can you imagine for a moment that a Being of such a nature could deliberately prepare a furnace, wherein to roast forever his own helpless offspring? Strange as it may appear, this blasphemous conception belongeth to the system of partialism. Its advocates can profess to believe that a Being of *Love* can make a hell, pile it high with fire and much wood, and breathe upon it the vital current in order that burning pitch and molten lava may gush forth in one eternal torrent upon the naked souls of his own formation!

7. Endless misery is incompatible with the design of creation itself. The Creator being infinitely happy and glorious in and of himself, could not have sent forth his mandate and called worlds into being for the purpose of adding to his own happiness or essential glory. The happiness of sentient created beings and the illustration of the divine attributes or the *declarative* praise and glory of God must therefore have been intended in the creation of the Universe of material and rational existence. It was the simple goings-forth of his own exhuberant goodness—the emanation of his love which gave life and created systems. Can it therefore be possible that endless misery is one of the effects of God's benevolence? Will the chief *end* of his creation ever be accomplished in

the flames of Tophet? Will it add to the *glory* of God for the larger part of mankind to be employed in perpetual blasphemy of his great and holy name? If so, let partialists endeavor to act consistently. Let them do what they can to add to this species of glory. Again, will the sinner who is writhing in endless pain "enjoy" God forever? Will they bask in the sunshine of his smiles and the blessed light of his countenance? "Whoso offereth *praise glorifieth* me," said the Lord, by the mouth of his servant David, and blessed be his name, "all his works shall *praise* him," and therefore show forth his *glory*, not however in the region of eternal death, but in the mansion of the skies, where seraphs sing and angels dwell.

8. We object to this doctrine, because it supposes God's plan in the salvation and happiness of rational intelligences will be defeated by the *abuse of the agency* he himself gave to such, which *agency* he is unable to control at his pleasure. Such is the natural inference from the *free-will* system, and it virtually denies the scripture doctrine that God "worketh in us to will and to do according to his good pleasure," and that "though a man's heart deviseth his way, the Lord directeth his steps." It gives, moreover, omnipotent power to the finite creature to do as he pleaseth, and yet holds him responsible; and what is worse, so reverses the common law of nature as to make the sinner deliberately choose "the pains of hell forever," in preference to the joys of paradise, although all mankind invariably prefer happiness to misery, when they have both understandingly set before them. Says the advocate of this scheme, "man is a *free agent*, capable of choosing good and refusing evil." True, he is, in a limited sense, free to act, but not altogether so. He is not *free* to do what God designed he should *not* do. He is not free to choose hell in preference to heaven, knowing the consequences of his choice, unless he acts without motive. If, moreover, any man is perfectly *free* to act independent of his Creator, he is not responsible for any of his acts to that Creator. He is independent of all power, and is therefore infinite, for none but Omnipotence can exercise perfect freedom. Besides, in

giving man an agency, was there or was there not, a design in the gift? If there was, will that design be frustrated? And if frustrated, was it not foreknown? And if foreknown, was it not determined? And will not the conclusion be, that God gave an agency which he *designed* for a certain end, but at the same time determined that said end should be frustrated by the power of the creature? Perhaps it will be urged that the Creator *chose* to be *ignorant* of the result when he bestowed an agency on the creature. If so, He can likewise choose to be *foolish* or *evil* or *weak*, and therefore is not the supremely perfect Jehovah.

9. We object to the doctrine on the Calvinistic principle, because it supposes it *right* to inflict unending torment on mankind, who had from all eternity in the councils of Jehovah, and without any act of faith or good works on their part, been *decreed* to such a destiny; and because they could not continue to evade the operation of such a decree against them, they are to be irretrievably lost, in obedience to the demands of Jehovah's sovereignty. Not conceiving of any possible way whereby any of the *non-elect* can possibly avoid their doom, or how it is possible under such views to clear the character of Jehovah of the most dishonorable and malignant purposes, we are compelled to throw aside the whole dogma as unworthy of the least credit.

10. The doctrine charges God with the grossest *partiality*. It supposes that he, of his own sovereign grace and good will, has selected a part of his creatures for endless felicity, and left the rest to endless wrath without regard to the merits of either class, but solely "in praise of his vindictive justice." Thus making an infinite difference between the final situation of creatures who are dependent upon him for life, and who are naturally alike worthy or unworthy of his care and attention. Even if this infinite distinction was based on the merit of works there is still a cruel partiality in it, for "all mankind (say the preachers) are totally depraved," and "do sin and only sin in all their moral conduct," until renewed and changed by the Holy Spirit. Good works are the effects then of the operations of the Spirit, which is only exercised in

behalf of the favorite *few*, while the rest are left to the sinful habit of *evil*, which is their nature. And because they are morally unable to do good without divine assistance, and this assistance is withheld, they are to perish! And is there no *partiality* in the gift of grace which brings about such an amazing difference in the final condition of the good and evil? Admitting that there is a vast difference between the voluntary acts of men, is there that difference which will warrant an *infinite* disproportion between the reward and punishment? Take the best man in the world and the worst, and it is impossible to make out an infinite difference in their finite acts, and yet on this principle are we told, that heaven and hell are finally to be allotted to mankind! If such is *impartiality*, in the name of common sense what is its opposite?

11. This doctrine charges God with *hypocrisy*. The invitations of the gospel are of general import. "Ho every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money come, yea, come buy wine and milk without money and without price." "Look unto me and be ye saved *all* ye ends of the earth"—"Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to *all* people." Now, on the supposition that any are finally lost, it must have been foreseen to Deity, when he gave all an invitation to partake of the promised blessing. He must have foreknown or determined that some should not enjoy eternal happiness when he invited all to the "feast of fat things." Thus he is charged with tantalizing the creature with the hypocritical offer of life, which he well knew was never to be his portion. Such solemn mockery belongeth not to that High and Lofty One who inhabiteth eternity, and therefore do we reject the dogma which teaches the notion.

12. We object to this doctrine of partialism, because it supposes that a fallen created Demon who was cast out of heaven for his sins, will finally so far prevail over his Creator as to rob him of a large part of his offspring, over whom he will ride and reign in terrific grandeur, until eternity itself grows old. Thus proving not only the more than almighty

power of a created Devil, but also his immortality, an attribute which Deity alone possesses.

13. This doctrine discredits the truth of Revelation by declaring that Christ will never accomplish that part of his mission relative to the "finishing of sin, making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness," and by holding out the idea that God is determined to bestow immortality upon that which he sent his son to abolish and destroy, even "him that hath the power of death, that is the devil," and his works; which is *sin*—thus claiming that Deity will interfere to prevent the accomplishment of his own gracious purposes, or that the *effect* which is *misery*, will continue long after the cause, *sin*, is removed or finished.

14. We object to the dogma because it supposes that finite man, by transgressing the law of his mind or understanding, can commit a sin infinite in character, and deserving of infinite punishment!—that every sin is infinite, and that therefore, the atonement made by Christ can only make satisfaction for *one* sin of *one* individual, because one infinite is not greater than another. Thus, it would be necessary that there should be as many infinite atonements as there have been and will be infinite sins, before satisfaction is complete. Consequently, the whole universe must go down to hell, there to pay the penalty left unpaid by the failure of Christ's reconciliation. So completely do such ideas prove *Universal Damnation* that we doubt not our opponents will themselves back out from the sweeping volcano of their own raising.

15. This dogma likewise denies the justice of God in the administration of his affairs here upon earth, by affirming that this life is a state of probation and not of retribution, and that men are not punished sufficiently in this world, but will be punished or rather tormented throughout eternity for their sins committed in this mortal state of existence, thus contradicting the plain and explicit doctrine of the Bible, that "verily He is a God who judgeth *in the earth*"—"Behold the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner," &c.

16. We object further to the doctrine, because it supposes a wrathful Deity, whose anger is to be averted by the flattery and incense of his creatures; and that men, by their good works, can so propitiate divine favor, as to induce him to save them from endless burnings, thus reversing that scripture testimony which declares that we *love* God because he *first loved* us, and that "in this was manifested the *Love* of God to us in that, while we were yet sinners Christ died for us," &c. Not only so, but the doctrine charges *folly* upon the Most High, inasmuch as it supposes God will *remain angry forever* with his creatures, and the Scripture saith, "Anger *resteth* in the bosom of *fools*."

17. Endless misery is contrary to the voice of nature—speaking universal benevolence and impartial Love. It is contrary to that righteous distribution of temporal blessings, which come alike upon "the just and the unjust," and which shower benedictions upon the "evil and unthankful" all together. Nor is there any thing in the works around us, in the heavens above, the earth beneath, or the system within us, which we can discover was *designed* to produce pain and unhappiness. All tends to good, and every thing is admirably contrived for the promotion of the pleasure and happiness of sentient intelligences. And will Deity convert all these scenes of beauty and joy into a vast lazar-house of woe? Will he forget his own nature and change the harmony and glory of this lower world for the deformity and despair of the pit infernal? So this doctrine supposes, contrary to all the evidence of God's goodness in creation, and contrary to the analogy of truth and nature, as every where delineated.

18. The sentiment of endless misery is contrary to the best wishes implanted in the breasts of all men by the Sovereign Creator of all things, and supposes that God has given us good desires without intending they should ever be exercised successfully. If it is the fervent wish of every humane and righteous man upon the earth that all his fellow-men may be rescued from the doom of the damned and be saved with an everlasting salvation? And will these pious aspirations of

soul never be gratified? Yes, saith the voice of inspiration—"the desire of the righteous *shall* be granted"—therefore, endless misery cannot be true:—none but *fiends* can *hope* for *it*, however *men* may affect to *believe* it.

19. This doctrine is not found in the Old Testament history. This point is now universally conceded. The word *Hell*, as it occurs in the Old Testament, the best informed *limitarian* Commentators now admit has no reference to endless suffering, but literally, to the "*grave*" or "place of departed spirits," and figuratively, to the troubles of life, such as David was delivered from, when he declared that "the pains of hell got hold on him and he was delivered from the lowest Hell." Nor was the doctrine of endless suffering intimated to the first offenders. To Adam a moral death was threatened when Jehovah said, "*In the day* thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely *die*," which threat was doubtless fulfilled *on the day* of transgression, or else we impeach the veracity of the Eternal. Why then, were not Adam and Cain and the wicked antedeluvians threatened with *endless misery*, if *it* be a *truth?* Why was it not laid down in the Law given by Moses to the people of Israel? And why have the Prophets not revealed the horrid sentiment? This will not be pretended by the boldest advocate of the doctrine. The covenant of works or the first covenant, contains no intimation of it, and of course it is preposterous to imagine that "*the better covenant*" which St. Paul says was "established on *better promises*," and of which Christ was the Mediator, could contain a *worse* doctrine than the old and faulty compact. Besides, the new covenant declares the Lord "will put his laws into the minds and write them in the hearts of his people; And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying know the Lord, for all shall know him from the least unto the greatest; for he will be merciful to their unrighteousness and their iniquities will he remember no more." Because therefore, to believe endless misery is to believe that the new covenant is worse than the old one, do we reject the sentiment.

20. The doctrine is objectionable, because it is contrary to the designs of punishment, which all will admit are these three—the reformation of the offender, the good of society, and an example to deter the evil-disposed from the commission of crime. Endless misery cannot answer either of these objects—It cannot reform the offender because there is no place for reformation after the punishment is inflicted. The *afterwards* will never come, when the peaceable fruits of righteousness are to be gathered, if the punishment is endless. Nor can it be by an example to deter men from sin in life, because they could never witness their fellow beings in torment until it is too late to be benefited thereby. As to the good of human society, which is the third object of punishment, *it* of course could not be promoted by the endless suffering of those who had transgressed human laws or divine.

21. We object to the doctrine, because it is of no use to any class of sentient intelligences. It cannot benefit the sinner who is to roast forever—It cannot add to the pleasure or the bliss of saints or angels in heaven—It is of no use to the world, and cannot add to the imperishable glory of the great *I AM.* For what then is it of use, save to gratify the malignant feelings of the supposed fiends of darkness? Nothing—As we cannot suppose that Deity would create a system of things which can be of no possible advantage to any, but only serves to cast a veil of thick gloom over the ways of a merciful Providence, we must reject the dogma.

22. We object to this doctrine, because it is contrary to the preaching of Christ and the writing and preaching of the Apostles. During thirty years of the ministry of the latter, as recorded in the Book of Acts, we have no account of their terrifying the people with an endless Hell, &c., although this was a period of remarkable outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Why was there not mention of such means, (in this day deemed so indispensable to the getting up of a revival) if the Apostles had used them? There can no good answer be given. The Evangelist John likewise, makes no mention of those aw-

ful incentives to religion. He does not use the word *Gehenna* (translated *Hell*) or any thing of the kind, simply because his book was written *after* the threatenings contained in Mathew, Mark and Luke were inflicted on the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Great Apostle to the Gentiles declared he had "not shunned to declare the *whole* counsel of God"—yet true it is, he omitted the doctrine of endless misery. Not a trace of it can be found in his writings fairly understood. Look at his creed as given us in 1st Timothy 2d, where he declares plainly that we should *pray* for all men, for it was "good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who *will have all men* to be *saved* and come to the knowledge of the truth—for there is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a *ransom for all men*, to be testified in due time—whereunto (says he) I am *ordained* a preacher and an apostle, I speak the truth and lie not." Now, if endless misery be *true*, the Apostle Paul was an impostor and hypocrite, or he would have framed his creed differently. According to modern theology it should have read thus—"I exhort therefore, that supplications, &c. be made for *some* men—for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have *some* men to be saved, &c.—for there is one God and one Mediator, *the God* Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *some* men," &c.

23. Endless misery is a doctrine which is opposed radically to the command of Jehovah to his children, to *love* their enemies, to *bless* those who curse them. Christ exhorted to the duty of returning good for evil as the perfection of human nature. "Be ye therefore perfect (says he) even as your father in heaven is perfect." But is it possible for man to be perfect as his Father in heaven is perfect, by forgiving his fellow men their trespasses against him, if God does not act upon the same principle towards his enemies? It is supposed by the advocates of endless misery, that God will *forever* remain *unforgiving* to a part of his creatures—and yet he requires, yea, commands those creatures to forgive and love

their enemies! Accordingly if the command is obeyed, the creature comes *nearer to perfection* than his heavenly Father—a proposition absurd and impossible, yet absolutely implied in the doctrine combatted.

24. We discard the sentiment—because it supposes faith in and obedience to the gospel as the sole conditions of final blessedness; thus consigning, at one fell swoop, the whole *heathen* world—and all *infants, idiots, &c.* who have never heard or known any thing respecting the matter to *endless perdition*—because they have been placed in a situation, by their Creator himself, where *faith* in the Gospel is an absolute impossibility! Hence we are compelled to reject a system which is so desolating, and so universal in its desolation.

25. This doctrine is opposed to all those passages of sacred writ which speak of the *design, extent and termination* of the Gospel mission. Christ came to save *the world* from sin—to destroy the works of the devil—to bring life and immortality to light, or to reveal the condition of all the dead after the resurrection, which is incorruptible, immortal, &c. and to bring all things into subjection unto him who put all things under him, that "God may be *all* in *all*." It is also opposed to all those passages which speak of the spread of Gospel Blessings. "All nations shall flow unto the mountain of the Lord's house." "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things—of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined." "The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together." "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him." "Thy people shall be *all* righteous,"—"thou shalt be my salvation unto the ends of the earth." Christ shall "see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." The "heathen shall be given to him for an inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession," &c. with hundreds of other passages which declare or intimate the "final restoration of all things spoken by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began."

26. *Endless misery* is inconsistent with the *will* of God, which is that "all men shall be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth." It is inconsistent with the *promise* of God to Abraham, that in him and his seed all the nations and families of the earth should be *blessed.* It is opposed to his *purpose* made known unto us, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he would "gather together in one all things in Christ,"—and it is contrary to the solemn oath of Deity that unto him "every knee should bow and every tongue confess, surely shall say, in the Lord have I righteousness and strength." Before we can therefore give our credit to the doctrine in question, we shall have to set aside not only his will, purpose and promise, but likewise his solemn oath, and take instead, the *traditions* of men which perish in the using.

27. The belief of this doctrine is useless, as a motive to virtue. The fear of a vindictive punishment never could produce true piety and worship, because "love begets love," and "we love God because he first loved us." The fear of the lash may excite a slavish homage, but can never excite true and acceptable obedience. On the contrary, we are assured that "the *goodness* of God (not his wrath and hatred) leadeth to repentance," and we are enjoined to give thanksgiving to him because his "*goodness* endureth forever," not because his vengeance will ever remain unappeased. Besides, "he that *feareth* is not made perfect in love," for "fear hath torment." How then can the fear of hell torments shed abroad the love of God in the heart and fit for the mansions of bliss near the throne of the Eternal? It is impossible.

28. The belief of this sentiment nurses exclusive and aristocratic feelings, contracts the social disposition, tends to persecution of all who think differently, and is incompatible with the golden rule of our Saviour to "do unto others as we would have others do unto us," for it speaks with emphasis to all without the pale of *our* church—"stand by for we are holier than thou." It is also licentious in its consequences, giving a clear field for sin in life with the prospect of a

future salvation by reason of a timely repentance on the death bed or under the gallows; gives a sanction to cursing and profanity among men, because it charges Deity with cursing his creatures with an *endless curse;* and has driven thousands to suicide, insanity and murder, by reason of its awful cruelty and utter desolation.

29. The belief of endless misery is inconsistent with the command to *pray* for all men. Those who do not *believe* in the final restoration of all things, when they pray for the salvation of all the human race, (which they do in almost every prayer offered up at the throne of grace,) are in the commission of *known sin.* They do not pray in faith, believing that they will receive—and "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." No matter, reader, what a man's profession may be, if he prays in faith for the salvation of all mankind he is at heart a Universalist. Partialists cannot thus pray in sincerity and consistency—yet they dare not *pray* for the *truth* of endless misery—they cannot *hope* for it. Why then profess a faith so *at war* with all their *wishes,* their *hopes,* and their *prayers?* If there was no other argument than this to advance against the horrid sentiment, we should deem the question settled. It cannot be that God would ever have required the petitions of his creatures for a matter which was *contrary* to his *holy will,* and which he had *determined* not to grant in answer to the prayer enjoined, and yet, have inspired his servants to teach us that it was *sinful* not to pray *in faith.* Let then the advocates of endless suffering for sin, *prove* the sincerity of their *faith* by *praying* as well as *preaching* that it may be *true.* Let them invoke high heaven to go on conquering and to conquer, until he has poured out the last vial of his hot indignation upon the souls of his reprobated children, and consigned them over forever to the keeping of the Prince of Darkness; and to the impious supplication let them add a hearty *Amen,* before they can expect us to abandon the true "faith once delivered to the saints,"—even that of a ransomed universe, and join them in a profession of that which brings a blight upon all the enjoyments of time,

which shades the tomb with the gloom of despair, and annihilates the hopes of a blissful immortality for a large majority of our race. These then are some of the objections we have to offer to the doctrine of endless misery. Choose ye, therefore, reader, whom you will serve. "If the Lord be God, serve him; but if Baal, then serve him."

CHAPTER VI.

Brief view of Universalists touching other topics of Theology.

Of the Existence of God.—We believe in the existence of a Supreme Intelligence—the Creator, Benefactor, and Father of all men, whose nature is *Love*, 1 John iv. 8—16, who is infinite in wisdom, power, goodness and truth—who is *one* and indivisible, Isaiah xlv. 5, 6—who is worthy to receive all glory and honor and power, because he has created all things and that for his pleasure, Rev. iv. 11—who is not worshipped by his creatures because he needeth their homage, Acts xvii. 25—but because it is becoming in them to pay their gratitude and thanksgiving to Him who "first loved them," and is ever bestowing alike upon the evil and unthankful of his choicest blessings. We believe that there is a perfect harmony in the divivine mind—that all things suggested by his goodness will be carried into effect by his Almighty power, according to a plan devised in his infinite wisdom—that no accident can occur to thwart his divine purpose or render void his gracious counsel—and that so pure and holy a Being can never suffer the endless existence of any evil in his universe, but will order all things for his own declarative glory and the well being of his subjects.

From this sketch of our faith in relation to the Supreme Being, it will be perceived: 1st. That we are not *Infidels* or *Atheists*, who deny the existence of a Supreme *First Cause*

of all things. 2d. That we are not *Tri-theists* or *Trinitarians*, who believe in the mysterious union of *three* Gods in *one*. 3d. That we are not *Polytheists* or believers in more Gods than *one*. And 4th. That we are not *Idolators* or worshippers of an imaginary Being, whose nature is *wrath*, and from whose throne of terror the lightnings of infinite vengeance flush in scathing desolation upon a large part of his offspring!

Of Revelation.—We believe in the authenticity and divine origin of the mission of Christ—that the Bible contains a revelation of the will and purposes of our Heavenly Father, and of the duties and final destiny of the human family—that the Gospel of Christ is a message of "good tidings of great joy to *all* people," Luke ii. 10—that he came to do the will of the Father, John vi. 38—was the 'faithful' and true 'witness,' Rev. i. 5—that his mission was the effect of God's *love* to men, Rom. v. 8—and its important purpose was to save them from *sin*, and crown them with life and immortality in a future state, 2 Tim. i. 10. Hence it will be perceived that we are not Sceptics or Deists, who doubt or deny a future state, but are Christians, or believers in the Saviour of the world. We believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," 1 John v. 1, Acts viii. 37—that he is a full and complete Saviour—having given himself to be the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world, 1 John ii. 2.

When we reflect that we are no where in the Bible commanded to believe in the devil and an endless hell, but simply to confess that "Christ is come in the flesh," and is the Saviour of men, it would seem unreasonable that we should be deemed destitute of Christian principles, or unworthy of the Christian name, because of our want of faith in the absurd creeds and confessions of human device, and human institution. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, Oh man, whosoever thou art that judgest."

Of Sin.—"All unrighteousness is sin." "Sin is a transgression of the law." "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed, then when *lust* hath

conceived it bringeth forth *sin*, and *sin*, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*," James i. 14, 15.—"Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence *even* of your *lusts*, that war in your members?" James iv. 1. Here we have the origin of sin—in the lusts of the flesh. No occasion then to admit the notion that sin first originated in heaven, and that a fallen angel or devil, is the real author of all evil. Nor can we admit the idea that sin is infinite and therefore deserving of infinite punishment. Man is a finite limited being, and is not, therefore, capable of committing any act more than finite. He cannot commit an infinite sin, or violate an infinite *law*, because such a law is above the capacity of the creature to understand. Nor can we believe that when the *cause* of all sin, the *lust* of the flesh, perishes with the body, that its *effect*, misery, will be more extended in duration. When the cause is removed the effect must cease, if there is any truth in philosophy.

Of Original Sin and Total Depravity.—These are dogmas of the day, which are rejected by all Universalists, so far as has come to our knowledge. They can see no justice or propriety in making the posterity of Adam responsible or culpable for the transgression of our first parents, but believe that every man is responsible only for his own acts. The doctrine of *original sin*, as generally understood to be a taint of guilt and moral defilement which was the consequence of Adam's transgression, and descending upon all the human family, is an error, moreover, contradicted by the voice of inspiration—see Ezekiel xviii. 1, 4, 19, 20,—"The soul that sinneth *it* shall *die*. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Besides "where there is no law there is no transgression," which is the case virtually with all idiots and infants. There is to them no law which they can understand, and hence none which they can violate. Of course then, such are in no sense sinners until they come to a knowledge of good and evil. Man comes pure from the hands of his Maker, and re-

mains innocent and spotless until he is led captive to the "law of sin which is in his members."

For proof of this refer to the conduct of Christ in regard to little children. "But Jesus said, suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."—Mat. xix. 14. How then were children guilty of *original sin* or *totally depraved* beings, if they were fit subjects of the kingdom of the Messiah? In fact, if man is totally corrupt—"averse by nature to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil,"—in the language of the catechism, he is not an accountable being. He is destitute of a *moral sense*, and therefore, not a subject of praise or blame for any act he may perform. Hence how aggravating is the cruelty of punishing a creature constituted with a wholly depraved nature, and over which he has himself no possible control, and how diabolical that infliction if endless in its continuance!

Of the Atonement.—This is a doctrine of the Bible, which commands and receives the assent of all enlightened believers in the "restitution of all things," notwithstanding the supposition of many to the contrary. It is true, however, that our views of the Atonement differ widely from the popular opinion on the subject. Instead of being viewed as a satisfaction made to divine justice, by an *innocent* substitute, on behalf of the *guilty* sinner, and this satisfaction consisting in Christ bearing in his own person, the punishment due to the sins of men, and suffering in the room and stead of the sinner, the penalty of the divine law—we look upon the matter in quite the opposite aspect. The word *Atonement* means simply *reconciliation*, and the sinner was the recipient thereof, not Jehovah. The following passage will place this doctrine in its true aspect: "But God commendeth his love to us in that, while we were *yet sinners*, Christ died for us,"—"for if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement,"—Rom. v. 8, 10, 11. Here mark the following particulars: 1st. Christ's death was in *commen-*

dation of God's *love*, not to appease his wrath. 2d. This love was manifested while the creature *was a sinner*, and an enemy. 3d. The reconciliation was on the part of man—the sinner was to be reconciled to God, not God to the sinner. And 5th. The apostle and his brethren had already "*received* the *atonement*," or reconciliation, and had "joy in God." See also 2d Cor. v. 18, 20; Col. i. 20; Eph. ii. 16,—"God was in Christ reconciling *the world* to himself," and the apostles were ambassadors for Christ, and prayed them to be "reconciled *to God*." We object then to the idea that God was the angry and dissatisfied party, and that to appease his own wrath and satisfy his own justice, he sent his own son, (or *himself*, if Christ be *equal* to the Father in power and glory,) to die for men, because it is contrary to right reason to suppose that the Eternal God is a changeable and passionate Being;—it is contrary to scripture testimony, as above quoted;—it is contrary to strict justice, to make the innocent bear the penalty due the guilty;—it is opposed to the object of punishment, which is the reformation of the offender;—and, finally, because it is averse to the explicit doctrine of the Bible, that God "will *by no means* clear the guilty," but "will render to every man according to his works," which last scripture is completely rendered void on the supposition of the vicarious suffering of Christ. The reader will judge for himself which view of this subject is most in accordance with truth, and most honorable to the character of the Creator.

Of Salvation.—The difference of opinion on this point between Partialists and Universalists, is as follows: The former believe that Christ came to *save* men from the *punishment* due to sin, and that this punishment is misery in a future state and endless in duration, in other words, the "pains of hell forever"; while the latter take the scriptures as their guide, and believe the record which declares that "his name shall be called Jesus, because he shall save his people from their sins." "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the *sin of the world*." "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all *iniquity*," &c. There is not a passage,

we believe, in the Bible, which intimates that the object of Christ's mission was to save men from an endless hell—notwithstanding it is a popular idea of salvation that it is such a deliverance. To be saved from penal fires in a future state, is the desire of most Christians—while they seem to regard as nothing, the greater salvation from the power and love of *sin* which is within. In the language of Dr. Channing, "men are flying from an outward hell, when in truth, they carry within them the hell they should chiefly dread. The salvation which man needs, and which brings with it all other deliverance, is salvation from the evil of his own mind. There is something far worse than outward punishment—it is *sin*." This is in accordance with the whole tenor of divine testimony. "God is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe," 1 Tim. iv. 10. "He that believeth *hath* everlasting life,"—not will have in a future state, but *hath* in the present tense. This "everlasting life," which is the portion of the believer only, is a *special salvation*, a present saving knowledge of God; for saith John, "This *is* life eternal that they might *know* thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent," John xvii. 3, and v. 24. Remark, that this "life eternal" was a present enjoyment, yet God is no less the Saviour of *all* men, as it is his purpose to redeem them from death, and make them heirs of an immortal life of blessedness beyond the grave. The life beyond the tomb is indissoluble, incorruptible and immortal, and the subjects of it can die no more, but are children of God being children of the resurrection—and are equal to the angels, Math. xxii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 36; 1 Cor. xv. 20-58. Let this distinction then be kept in view between a present salvation from sin, and the "restitution of all things" in a life of immortality beyond the grave, and much of the difficulty and error in the world on the subject of the salvation of the Gospel will pass away. Be it remembered in the mean time that they who preach a *salvation* from punishment do not teach the true doctrine of the Bible. Christ came not to save men from endless misery, but from iniquity and from death. Hence there are evidently too many "false teachers gone out into the

world," against whose pernicious doctrines the reader is affectionately cautioned.

Repentance.—This also is a scripture doctrine and of twofold meaning. It signifies: 1st. A general *reformation*, and was applied to that change of administration effected by Christ. He abolished the "divers washings and carnal ordinances" of the Mosaic dispensation when he introduced Christianity—Heb. ix. 10. The injunction to "*repent* for the kingdom of heaven [not hell] is at hand," may be considered to imply the necessity of that general change of worship instituted by Christ, for to *repent* is to *reform*. 2dly. It is also of individual application. *Repentance* for sin, or in other words, a "*turning* from iniquity," is the duty of all rational creatures. We do not believe, however, that repentance consists simply in a sorrow for sin without any amendment. St. Paul says in 2d Cor. vii. 10, that "godly sorrow *worketh* repentance," not that godly sorrow and repentance are one and the same thing, as many suppose, or that as the poet hath it,—

> "*Repentance* shall like rivers flow
> From both my streaming eyes."

This may be very good repentance for those who still cherish the love of sin in their hearts, and who would "roll it as a sweet morsel under their tongues," were it not for the fear of the burning lake; but it is not the kind of doctrine which can be made out of the scriptures. Let those who doubt search and see. In fine, although this duty is essential to our well-being in life and to our enjoyment of a present gospel salvation, we cannot find the evidence to convince us that our *eternal destiny* hangs upon such a condition. That, blessed be God, is an inheritance which is not forfeited by our waywardness or unbelief, because it is the *gift* of God's free grace and not reckoned of debt.

Of Faith.—The remarks previously made concerning the necessity of repentance will also apply in regard to Faith. This exercise of the mind is necessary to our *present* joy and peace, but will not affect our final destiny. He that believeth

enters into rest. Of all people, moreover, none have more of the true Christain Faith than Universalists. Our faith is universal and complete. We "stagger not at the promises of God through unbelief, but are strong in faith, giving glory to God." Rom. iv. 20. Our confidence is strong. Our faith is constant—attended with *hope*—"worketh by love," and not by wrath—is founded upon the will, purpose and unconditional promises of the Most High, and is "perfect, lacking nothing." It is also impartial in its character, embracing within its saving provisions, all the family of mankind, for the promise of blessing to *all* the kindreds, nations and families of the earth, in and through the seed of Abraham (Christ) is called the Gospel, in Galatians, iii. 8. It was faith in this promise, that *justified* the Father of the faithful, the patriarch Abraham, and was "accounted to him for righteousness." Rom. iv. 3. It was then all-sufficient. Such a faith have *we*, unmixed with doubt, and pledging blessing to every creature. And this faith delivers us from the bondage of "fear which hath torment," and translates us into the life and liberty of the Gospel. He who has not this faith, remains in doubt and perplexity, for "he that believeth not is condemned already." Neither faith nor works, however, can change or disannul the purposes of God's grace in regard to our final condition. The unbelief of any cannot make the faithfulness of God of none effect.

Of Conversion or the New Birth.—Universalists believe in all that the Scriptures teach on this subject, viz:—"Every one that *loveth* is born of God," 1 John iv. 7, and "whoso believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," v. 1. They believe in a change of views and feelings—a change of disposition and a turning from error to truth, and from a love of sin to a love of holiness. They believe in the regulation of perverted faculties and in the subjection of licentious passions to the mild but potent sway of virtue and piety—but in a *miraculous* change in the *very nature* of man by the supernatural operations of the Holy Spirit of God, from a state of innate and total depravity to an opposite condition, they have

no faith, for want of scriptural evidence on the subject. Such a doctrine we consider the "mystery of iniquity," having no sanction from reason or revelation, inasmuch as it represents the all-merciful Jehovah, as constituting his children so corrupt as to be unable to change their own natures, and yet, without they *do* work a God-like *miracle*, consigning them to interminable anguish! So absurd and dishonoring a sentiment we reject without hesitation.

Of a Day of Judgment.—Universalists believe that "*now* is the judgment of this world," John xii. 31; that "verily he is a God that judgeth *in the earth*," Ps. lviii. 11; that "all his ways are judgment," Deut. xxxii. 4; that he hath given authority to the Son to "execute judgment," John v. 27; that for judgment did Christ "come into the world," John ix. 39: and that when he has put down all rule, authority and power, he will himself be "subject to Him who put all things under him that God may be all in all," 1 Cor. xv. 24-28. The scripture meaning of the *day of Judgment* is the TIME or SEASON when God sees fit to send his retributions upon the rebellious. For instance—the day of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah was *their day of judgment*, and so of the time of trouble and calamity which fell upon the Jewish people—this was *a day of Judgment* to them. So likewise to all evil-doers; and "in the earth" or in this life are God's judgments inflicted. Of course then, we find no proof of a second day of Judgment in eternity, whereto all mankind are to be gathered from their previous allotment, in heaven or hell, in order to stand a new trial and receive a second sentence to their final doom. God could not have wished such a convocation of the spirits of his creatures, with a view to ascertain whether any had, at death, been consigned to a wrong place, for he is Omniscient; nor can we conceive of the justice of punishing men (as the doctrine of a judgment in eternity implies) thousands of years *before* their final trial—then to mock them with the forms of justice, only to serve as an excuse for their return to the gloomy prison whence they came to judgment! On the contrary, the certainty and rectitude of God's judg-

ments are with us sources of joy and gratulation. We can say, as did the sweet singer of Israel, "Let the floods clap their hands, let the hills be joyful together, before the Lord, for he cometh to *judge the earth;* with righteousness shall he judge the world and the people with equity." Ps. xcviii. 4, 9.

Of the Devil or Satan.—This is a term frequently applied in the scripture to individuals, and means an adversary, accuser, slanderer, &c. It is also used to personify the principle of evil in the human breast. The idea of a "fallen angel" becoming a personal devil—the autocrat of all the nether regions—the Prince of the power of the air—chained in hell, yet, as a roaring lion, going to and fro through the earth, seeking whom he may devour, is too ridiculous to receive the sanction of this enlightened age. It is a foolish superstition which will ere long pass into oblivion with the memory of witches, ghosts and goblins. Nor would it have been pretended that the notion derives any authority from the Bible had it not been the interest of the translators and their priestly successors, to have some "bug-bear" with which to frighten the credulous. We are certain at least that a candid interpretation of the Holy Oracles will give no countenance to the common opinion on the subject. The devil of lust and passion is the one men have most need to dread; and the promise is that if they *resist* this personage he *will flee* from them—James iv. 7, which would not likely be the case if he was the all-powerful Prince of darkness he is generally supposed to be.

Of Rewards and Punishments.—Universalists believe that God will "render to every man according to his work,"—Ps. lxii. 12; that he "will by no means clear the guilty," and that "the righteous are recompensed *in the earth*, much more the wicked and the sinner,"—Prov. xi. 31. They likewise believe all just punishment to be disciplinary in its character, and designed for the correction of the punished, that they may "*afterwards* bring forth the peaceable fruits of righteousness,"—Heb. xii. 11. Hence the conclusion that *end-*

less suffering is a fable—because to *that* there is no afterwards wherein the fruits of righteousness can be produced; nor is such a punishment *according to the works.* It will also appear from Ex. xxxiv. 7; Isa. xl. 2; that the punishment of sin is not inconsistent with its *forgiveness* or *removal,* for such is the primary meaning of the term *forgive*—"taking away sin," and "forgiving iniquity," being phrases of the same import.

Of the Trinity.—That the Saviour of the world was ever the "very and eternal God," and "equal to the Father in power and glory," we cannot believe for the following among many other reasons.—1st. The strict *unity* of the Divine Being is clearly and explicitly taught in the Scriptures: "I am Jehovah, and there is none else. There is no God beside me." "I am God, and there is none else—I am God, and there is none like me." "I am the first and I am the last, and beside me there is no God. Is there a God beside me? I know not any." If then the Father, Jehovah, be the *one* only "true and living God," there can be no propriety in making Jesus Christ equal unto him.—2d. The word *Son* implies inferiority or inequality. The Son can never be one and the same with the Father who begat him.—3d. Christ prayed to the Father and taught his disciples so to do. Would he have done so if he was co-equal with God?—4th. A strictly Divine being could not have died on the cross; and for the "human nature" (so called) of Christ thus to have suffered, would only have brought about a *finite* atonement for the sins of the world! On this supposition, moreover, the *infinite* character of the great sacrifice is virtually given up by the Trinitarian.—5th. Christ himself very explicitly declares the *Unity* and the *Superiority* of the Father. "Hear Oh Israel, the Lord our God is *one* Lord." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him *only* shalt thou serve." "My Father is greater than I." "When thou prayest, pray to thy Father who is in secret." "In that day ye shall ask me nothing—whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you." "At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you." This latter

text will explain one in another place, which says, "I and my Father are one."—Those whom Christ said were in him, were in the Father also, in the same sense that the Saviour himself was; i. e. *oneness* of design and operation. If it is believed, from the last text quoted, that Christ and God are *one* in nature and power, and consequently, that Christ is "very God," the disciples were likewise *one* with the Father, and likewise "very Gods." For, says Christ, "I am in the Father, and you in me, and I in you,"—i. e. if they were in Christ, and Christ in them, and Christ in God, they were in God also, being in Christ, who was in God, and therefore were "very Gods," as much as Christ.—6th. Christ not only acknowledges his inferiority in power to the Father, but likewise in wisdom. He says, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man: no, not the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Thus shewing that Christ was not infinitely wise, as God; and therefore not equal to the Father. In another place Christ says, "And this is life eternal, to know thee, *the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." Hence neither Christ nor the Holy Ghost could be God, or there is no sense in the Saviour's language. 7th. Our Saviour is called in Jeremiah, "Jehovah our righteousness." And the same appellation is given to Jerusalem, in the same book. Moses is said to have been a "God to Pharaoh." In like manner, Pharoah, Abraham, and Joseph are called "Lords." Here the plural form of the original word is applied, according to the Hebrew idiom, to one individual, so that no argument can be fairly drawn from the ascription of *plurality* to the Divine Being, in favor of the idea of more than one person in the Godhead; nor from the meaning of titles bestowed upon Christ, are we to infer his divinity; because, in that case, we should have a multiplicity of persons in the Godhead.—8th. The apostle Paul did not believe in the Deity of Christ. He says, "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you." Again—thus: "For there is *one God*, and one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus. "Then shall the Son also be subject to him,

that God may be all in all."—9th. Christ thus explains the matter: "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scriptures cannot be broken, say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God." What language can be more explicit in declaring the inferiority of the Son to the Father? We can conceive of none, whatever. The passage quoted from John thus, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one" is undoubtedly an interpolation on the original. Of 112 manuscripts in Greek, containing this epistle, in but three of them, and these modern, is this passage to be found. It is likewise said to be found in no Greek writing before the thirteenth century, and was not written probably for a thousand years after the epistle was composed. Such is the opinion of many learned men, orthodox and others. But admitting its genuineness, it can be easily explained to mean nothing more than *unity of evidence.* The Father, Son, and Spirit, could not give a different "record," one from the other; but it does not necessarily follow therefrom, that God's Spirit must be a person, and united with the Father and the Son to make three persons in one Godhead, "equal in power and glory."

Of Election.—That this is a scripture doctrine will not be disputed, but that the common interpretation thereof is correct is by no means so clear. That God has, "from all eternity," *elected* some men as the heirs of everlasting bliss and passed by the rest, or *reprobated* them to never-ending despair, is an idea abhorrent to every benevolent feeling of our natures, and dishonoring to the character of God. But the true doctrine of the Bible, on this subject, is at once honorable to the Supreme Being and consolatory to man. In Isaiah xlii. 1, 6, the prophet speaks of Christ as an *elect* person: "Behold my servant whom I uphold; mine *elect*, in whom my soul delighteth." * * * "I, the Lord have *called* thee in righteousness," &c. Of course, this election had for its object the good of mankind, even the world which

Christ came to save, and cannot be brought into the support of the Calvinist's creed. The Jewish people also, as a nation, were the "elect of God." "For thou art a *holy people* unto the Lord thy God: The Lord thy God hath *chosen* thee to be a special people unto himself." Deut. vii. 6. And the purpose of God, in thus choosing this people as his own favored nation and afterwards rejecting them for a time, is fully set forth by the Apostle Paul, in Romans xi. 25, 32, &c. "For I would not brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, (lest you should be wise in your own conceits) that blindness in part is happened unto Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." "As concerning the Gospel, they (the Jews) are enemies for your sakes, but as touching the *election*, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes." &c. Compare this with Rom. ix. 11, 12, 13, and the reference to God's dealings with the Jews and Gentiles, as personified by Jacob and Esau, will be apparent. There does not appear to be any allusion whatever to the final doom of *individuals*, by the greater love borne to the former than to the latter. Again, Saul of Tarsus was one of the *elect* or chosen. "But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way for he is a *chosen* vessel unto me to bear my name before the Gentiles," &c. Acts ix. 15. And this "chosen vessel" declares that "all things will work together *for good* to them that are called according to his purpose." Rom. viii. 28. And what that purpose was may be ascertained from his epistle to the Ephesians, 1st chapter, 4–12. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one *all things* in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him, in whom we also have obtained an inheritance being *predestinated* according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." This is the scripture doctrine of election.—It is the choosing of a few to testify of the purpose of God

to save the world. It is the election of a part for the benefit of the whole, somewhat on the principle that the citizens of this republic *choose* or *elect* a few of their own number to represent and *serve* the rest in various capacities. It is not the choosing of a *few* to endless life and condemning the *many* to the flames of Tophet. Room would fail us to explain this subject more fully, even were the necessity for so doing as great now as formerly; but thanks to the progress of light and more enlarged views of God's providence, there are but few in this day, who will openly advocate the once fashionable doctrines of "election and reprobation." We therefore dismiss the subject.

CHAPTER VII.

Ordinances—Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Of Water Baptism.—Universalists, so far as the writer has any information, do not consider the ordinance or rite of *water* Baptism as of binding obligation upon Christian professors of the present age, or of any age, since the establishment of the Gospel Dispensation upon the earth. On a critical examination of the scriptural use of the word *Baptism*, we find that there are different meanings attached thereto. First: "Washing or sprinkling the body or garments, or dipping the finger, or foot, or food, or garments in divers liquids, such as oil, vinegar, honey and blood." Such washings, sprinklings and dippings are expressed in the Greek of the 70 by the same terms translated baptism, baptize, &c. in the New Testament. Second: *Water* Baptism which was peculiar to John the Baptist. "John truly baptized with water." "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance." Third: The custom among the Jews of *washing* their hands before meals, is expressed by the same Greek word transla-

ted *Baptize*. FOURTH: The Baptism "in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, is a figurative allusion to the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, and the pillar of cloud by day which guided them in their journeyings. FIFTH: Baptism is used to signify Doctrine, as in Acts xviii. 25, "He spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the *baptism* of John," or the doctrine of John. Again, it is said, "when John had first preached before his coming the *baptism* of repentance to all the people of Israel,"—that is, the doctrine of repentance. SIXTH: We read of a Baptism which Christ was to suffer. "Are ye able to drink of my cup and be baptized with the baptism I am baptized with?" "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." Here manifest reference is had to the agony of the crucifixion. SEVENTH: There is the "baptism of Fire and the Holy Ghost," which was peculiar to the Gospel of Christ. Says John the Baptist, I indeed baptize you with *water* unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall *baptize* you with the *Holy Ghost* and with *fire*." This is the true Christian Baptism of which John's baptism was the figure, and hence, if it be true, that there is but "one Lord, one Faith, *one* Baptism," we have no reason to give the preference to the figure over the reality, or the shadow over the substance.

The following are a few of the reasons why Universalists do not lay great stress upon the rite of Water Baptism. John the Baptist was the fore-runner of Christ—a prophet to predict the coming of the Messiah, and to "prepare the way of the Lord. He was the "voice of one crying in the wilderness," and preaching "the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He expressly undervalues his own dispensation in view of the greater baptism of Christ, and declares that he came baptizing with water, that Christ "should be *made manifest* to Israel." He positively affirms that he was not the Christ, but "was sent *before* him. He must increase, (says he,) but I must decrease,"—thus proving that his dispensation was to

be superceded entirely by that of Christ, of whom he was the fore-runner. If so, his ordinances can be of no value in the eye of the Christian. Furthermore, *John the Baptist was not a Christian:* that is, he was not a *follower* of Christ, but the last of the race of Prophets, whose duty it was to foretell future events. The dispensation of the Gospel was not *then* established, and of course John could not have been a member of the "kingdom of heaven," which was not then in existence, though nigh "at hand." Christ's language, moreover, in reference to John settles the point. "Verily, I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist, notwithstanding he that is *least* in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." Mat. xi. 11. He also says that the "law and the prophets were *until John*," and that "*since* that time, (not *before*, nor *at*) the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it." From all which it appears to us that those who are so strenuous in regard to *water* Baptism, in this day, have more regard to the obsolete ordinances of John the Baptist than the teachings of Christ, and that such indeed may be very good *Baptists*, but are not *thereby* entitled to the name or character of *Christian* people!

There are still other considerations in favor of the view we have taken of this subject. "Christ baptized not but his disciples," which could hardly have been the case if he had established the ordinance of water baptism. He would, in all probability, have enforced the observance of the same by practising it himself on every opportunity. St. Paul also, "thanked God" that he had "baptized none but Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanus," "lest any should say he had baptized in his own name,"—a very insufficient reason, certainly, for neglecting a known and positive duty, if he had viewed it as such. He declares, moreover, that he "was not sent to baptize but to preach the Gospel."

In our humble judgment, therefore, it would be quite as well for those who have so long quarrelled about the *mode* of water Baptism, and the *proper subjects* of it, to prove first,

that it is, in truth, a Christian ordinance and of perpetual obligation. This point has been taken for granted, when it is by no means easy to establish its truth, from the word of God. On this as upon other topics, however, the Universalist's creed is, "let every one be persuaded in his own mind." To his own Master let every one stand or fall.

Of the Lord's Supper.—There is some diversity of opinion among Universalists in relation to this institution. While some reject all ordinances as contrary to the spiritual character of the mission of reconciliation, and as those things which the apostle commanded to "touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using," (Col. ii. 20, 22) others deem the ordinance of the last Supper to be of perpetual obligation upon all who take the name of Christ, and accordingly are in the habit of attending to the same, at stated periods. The writer is himself not satisfied that the observance of this rite is a positive *commandment* upon Christians, nevertheless he believes that the stated commemoration of the dying love of the Redeemer of the world is at once grateful to the pious heart, and calculated to excite new emotions of love and gratitude in the soul. He is therefore in favor of this interesting institution being observed, but would have it entirely free from all exclusiveness of spirit. When the "Lord's Table" is set, let the invitation thereto be general, but profane not the name of Christ by spreading a *sectarian* board and dignifying it with such an appellation, when its blessings are confined to a select few. So far as we are certified, Universalists do not consider the ordinance of the Lord's Supper as a *Sacrament*, a participation in which imposes the obligation of an *oath* upon communicants, and invokes an awful penalty upon those who partake thereof unworthily. Such an idea seems to us rather serving to repel than to encourage the humble believer in his duty, and is so far of injurious tendency. When the ordinance is made a test of true faith and genuine piety, it has a tendency also, to nurse a spirit of self-righteousness in the human heart, which is altogether incompatible with the spirit of the Gospel. This evil can however be obviated, on the principle of *open*

communion, and in this light the celebration of the ordinance is regarded with increasing interest by the Universalist public.

CHAPTER VIII.

Church Government, &c.

The Universalist Denomination is governed on strictly *Congregational* principles—every society of believers being entirely independent in its character, and acknowledging no allegiance to Presbyteries, Synods, Conferences or Bishops. The primary assemblies are known by the title of Societies—in addition to which there are Associations, which are bodies composed of lay and clerical delegates from societies,—next are State Conventions, composed of delegates from Associations, and these Conventions send delegates to the General Convention of the United States. These bodies are posessed of *advisory* powers, being organized more for the purposes of Fellowship and as a bond of fraternal union than as Ecclesiastical Judicatories. They, however, assume it as a right, in order to guard themselves from reproach and evil communications, to visit upon the heads of disorderly members a *withdrawal of fellowship*, which is the only penalty inflicted. The government of Societies and Churches is equally strict, as will be seen from the annexed formula of Constitution, the like of which is usually adopted.

FORM OF CONSTITUTION.

PREAMBLE.—Whereas it is the duty of every rational creature to pay his homage to the Supreme Creator and Governor of the Universe ; and whereas we are permitted in this land the unrestricted liberty of conscience and right of private judgment in matters of faith and duty, and are allowed to worship God, in whatever manner it may seem good to ourselves, we the undersigned, believing in the existence of "ONE LIVING AND TRUE GOD" whose nature is LOVE, and whose Perfections are Infinite ; and confiding in his gracious purpose, as revealed to us in the Gospel of of his Son and the Scriptures of Truth, to bestow upon *all*

his intelligent offspring a *glorious and blessed immortality*; and further, believing that it is at once the duty and interest of all men to be "careful to maintain good works, for these things are good and profitable unto men," do hereby, for the better securing of these objects, *unite ourselves* in an *associate capacity*, and agree to be governed by the following Constitution:

Article 1. This Society shall be called the First Universalist Society of

Art. 2. It shall meet quarterly on the 1st of January, April, July and October, and at such other times as may be deemed expedient, on the call of any three members of the Society.

Art. 3. There shall annually be elected at the meeting, the following Officers: one Moderator, one Clerk, one Treasurer, and Trustees, all of whom shall constitue a Board for the transcaction of business. In case of vacancy by death, removal or resignation, the same shall be supplied at the next meeting of the Society.

Art. 4. The Moderator shall preside at all meetings of the Society and the Board of Officers, preserve order and perform all the usual duties of his station. In his absence, his place shall be supplied, for the time being, by nomination.

Art. 5. The Clerk shall be required to keep a record of all the proceeedings of the Society and the Board, enrol the names of members, and give notice of each meeting, at least days before said meeting to all the members thereof.

Art. 6. The Treasurer shall collect or cause to be collected all monies due this society, and to pay over the same to the order of the Board, signed by the Moderator, and countersigned by the Clerk, in obedience to the instructions of the Society or the Board. He shalll also present a report of the condition of the Treasury, at each Quarterly meeting.

Art. 7. The Officers of the Society shall act as an Executive Committee in behalf of the Society; devise ways and means for discharging the ordinay expenses of the same, procure legal titles to the property which may come into its pos-

session, and transact all other secular business not otherwise provided for in the Constitution. They may hold their sessions as often as may be necessary, three days notice being given of each meeting.

Art. 8. Not less than members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business by the Society, and not less than a quorum for the transaction of business by the Board.

Art. 9. Any individual of *good moral character*, who may desire a membership in this society shall have his or her name propounded by a member, at any regular or special meeting, and shall be received on a vote of two thirds of the members present. This reception shall be public or private, and attended with no other ceremony than a profession of faith in Christ, and signing the constitution, on the part of the candidate, and the giving, by the minister in charge, of the right hand of fellowship.

Art. 10. Any member shall have the privilege of withdrawing his or her membership at pleasure, and if in good standing shall be entitled to a Certificate from the Clerk, to that effect. Any member whose walk and conversation is disorderly, and calculated to bring reproach upon the Society, shall be privately admonished therefor, according to the injunction of scripture, (Mathew, xviii. 15, 17, 22; Luke, xvii. 3, 4.) and if such member continues obstinate, the society may, as the last alternative, withdraw fellowship from him or her.

Art. 11. This Society is hereby declared *Independent* of all other ecclesiastical accociations, and will acknowledge no allegiance to any other power, save the expressed will of a majority of its own members, in accordance with its own constitution and the laws of the land.

Art. 12. This Constitution may be altered or amended, by a vote of two thirds of the members present at any regular meeting, provided the amendment proposed, is submitted in writing at the previous meeting and recorded with its minutes.

THE END.

CONTENTS.

Preface	Page	3.
Comparative view of Religious Creeds		7.
Proofs of Universalism from the Attributes of Deity		24.
Universalism a Bible Doctrine—seventy-five reasons		37.
Universalism a New Testament Doctrine—140 reasons.		48.
Hell, Sheol, Hades, Gehenna, Tartarus,		66.
Damnation, 74. Everlasting 76. Destruction 81. Fire Hell-Fire		83.
Comments on various passages of Scripture		86.
Popular Objections against Universal Salvation considered		132.
Twenty-nine Objections to the dogma of endless misery.		159.
Views of Universalists on other topics of Theology		175.
" "	on the Existence of God	175.
" "	of Revelation; of Sin	176.
" "	Original Sin and Total Depravity	177.
" "	on the Atonement	178.
" "	of Salvation	179.
" "	of Repentance and Faith	181.
" "	of Conversion or New-Birth	182.
" "	Judgment Day	183.
" "	Devil; Rewards and Punishments	184.
" "	Trinity	185.
" "	Election and Reprobation	188.
" "	Water Baptism	189.
" "	The Lord's Supper	192.
Church Government and form of Constitution for U. Societies		193.

ERRATA.

The reader is requested to correct the following errors: In the 23d page, second line from top, for the words "Protestant Queen Mary," read Protestant Queen *Elizabeth.* For the words "view of this substitute" in page 179 and third line from close of first paragraph (in part of the edition) read view of this *subject*; and in the page preceeding, article Atonement, seventh line from beginning, for "innocent subject," (in part ed.) read innocent *substitute.* There are also a few typographical blunders which we have not time to point out.

SEP 30 1982

WELLS BINDERY
WALTHAM, MASS.
DEC. 1951

3 2044 054 767 553

ANDREWS, L F W
The "two opinions" or
salvation & damna-
tion.

6[illegible]
Un[illegible] 5
A[illegible]7t[illegible]
[illegible]37